

UNITY AFTER FRAGMENTATION

In recent years, much new work has been done on *Jubilees* and related *Jubilees* traditions, with special attention to issues concerning the lines of composition, authorship, fragment re-identification, Ethiopic reception, interpretation and *Fortschreibung*. This thematic issue of the *Revue de Qumran* originated with James Kugel's suggestion that we bring together at an SBL session a group of scholars who could address this new work from a variety of perspectives. We are grateful to John F. Kutsko, executive director of the Society for Biblical Literature, for enabling that special joint Pseudepigrapha and Qumran session on the theme *Composition, Authorship, and Reception of the Book of Jubilees*. We also express our appreciation to two doctoral students at Yale who helped with the editing of this issue, James Nati and Justin White, and we acknowledge the support of Jean-Sébastien Rey and Corrado Martone.

In the seven essays that follow, a variety of perspectives are presented on how to tell the complex narrative of the composition of *Jubilees*. To be sure, there are severe disagreements around how to conceive of *Jubilees* as a *work* or as a *unified text* as well as how to understand the history of its production both within and beyond the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and certainly in the later Ethiopic manuscript traditions. While the disagreements are profound, we want to point out first of all what we consider to be points of agreements. First, we can all agree that *Jubilees* represents a rich interpretive tradition which integrates, transforms and rethinking texts such as Isaiah, Genesis, *Enoch*, *Aramaic Levi* and Exodus (among other works). Second, even if we don't agree on the unity of *Jubilees*—whether it is by the hand of one or two authors or even more, whether it was composed over a long period of time when reworking, expansion and multiple versions might have been in circulation—we can nevertheless agree that the general contours of that narrative are relatively consistent across versions of the book. Even if the fragmentary, later manuscript traditions generate

different viewpoints with respect to authorship and composition—concerning Kugel’s interpolator, Segal’s legal material and the early presence or absence of chapter one—we can nevertheless identify a core narrative. Additionally, the contributions to this issue all either implicitly or explicitly jettison “rewritten bible” as an operative category for *Jubilees*. They do not adhere to earlier divisions between canonical and non-canonical texts, thereby excluding *Jubilees* from an authoritative “canon” or “collection.” “Rewritten bible” is misleading in its assumptions about both canon and composition, and we take this opportunity to urge that its use be generally discontinued.

When Geza Vermes coined the term “rewritten bible” in 1961, *Jubilees* was of course one of his seminal examples. Vermes expanded the scholarly imagination by bridging the gap between biblical and rabbinic corpora and by challenging scholars to think across religious divides (notably Jewish and Christian traditions); to think across canonical divides and to think differently about the emergence of the history of interpretation.

Today we want to argue for an even more radical departure from Vermes’ view (which is surely supported by Kugel, Segal and Tigchelaar), moving farther away from even these residual elements, but without losing sight of the argument for a kind of unity that is reflected in VanderKam’s essay. Perhaps we can all agree on a kind of “Unity after Fragmentation.”

In *Scripture and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, Vermes wrote:

In order to anticipate questions, and to solve problems in advance, the midrashist inserts haggadic development into the biblical narrative—an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural exegesis itself. (*Scripture and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, 95)

Vermes makes three assumptions that many, even most scholars still make about *Jubilees*.

- 1) There is already a relatively stable biblical narrative.
- 2) Much of rewritten bible is driven by exegetical questions and problems arising from a particular text.
- 3) A given work of “rewritten bible” stems from the solutions to those problems proposed by a single writer: “the midrashist.”

It is important to note that Kugel and Segal reject the second idea. They do not accept that *Jubilees* is driven *solely* by exegetical problems. Rather, there is a strong ideological and even theological motivation behind the interpretation. Both find tensions that cannot and should not be harmonized, because they are expressions or symptoms

of ideological tension. They differ over whether there are two sources, a proto-Jubilean text plus a number of interpolations, as Kugel thinks, or whether there are multiple sources that are prior to *Jubilees* and only at a later stage integrated and reworked by Segal's redactor. Kugel considers the exact number of sources an open question:

If vision 2 was indeed the creation of the author of a Jacob or Levi Apocryphon (or some later supporter thereof), is its creator to be identified with the author of those other, apparently late, additions to *Jubilees* mentioned earlier, the Sabbath laws of chapter 50 and one of the two passages concerning fourth-year produce? That is to say, was there only one additional editor or copyist responsible for the final edition of *Jubilees* that we now possess? Or were there two, three, or even more hands involved in its acquiring its final shape? This is a question that given our present state of knowledge, must remain open.

To acknowledge that there is much that we continue not to know about the history of *Jubilees*' composition is the beginning of wisdom. We suggest the suspension of Vermes' first and third assumptions—namely, the stability of the biblical narrative and the association of a unitary text with a single author biblical process of “Torah.” We do not mean that the text was unstable. On the contrary, we believe that there was a text very much like what we have come to call the Pentateuch at the time when *Jubilees* was composed. However, this proto-Pentateuch was of course the product of a series of developments, and these developments were in no sense over. In other words, there was no canonical closure of the Pentateuch at this time, and there is therefore every reason to think of *Jubilees* as part of the continuing development of a still vital Pentateuchal tradition. This distinguishes *Jubilees* from midrash.

Yet another point of convergence among the essays touches upon compositional practices. Just as compositional practices that gave rise to the Pentateuchal text continued, so too, the development of ideas and textual forms in *Jubilees* should not be separated from the development of ideas and textual forms in the Pentateuch, as if they were two distinct processes. We would like to suggest that we think in terms of *traditional processes*. From these processes, texts of more or less fixity sometimes precipitate out, just as, in chemistry, separable solids sometimes form within a medium that remains liquid. Understood in this way, the writing and rewriting of *Jubilees* is continuous with the writing and rewriting of Genesis and other biblical traditions. This sheds light on the question whether *Jubilees* is to be thought of as intended to *replace* Genesis. As Kugel has said, we are confronted here with a false dichotomy: is *Jubilees* a commentary or a rival? *Jubilees* should not be understood

either as a commentary on a static tradition, or as intended to replace an existing stage of that tradition. Rather, *Jubilees* is at once both new and part of the ongoing, dynamic tradition of Torat Moshe. At the end of the day, we can understand complex compositional processes with our contributors who argue for a unified text or with contributors who argue for multiple revisions of *Jubilees*.

VanderKam, Kugel, and Segal each point to the renewed debate among scholars with respect to the composition of *Jubilees*. As each of these three scholars demonstrate, this debate has implications for our reading of *Jubilees*, but even more so for our understanding of the processes of creation, transmission, and interpretation of texts in Ancient Judaism.

The debate, then, speaks not only to *Jubilees* but also to how we as scholars should construct critical editions when we have multiple manuscripts of a single work and when we have fragments of a work that we know of from manuscript traditions that are from centuries later.

How we conceive of *Jubilees* will also have a hand in how we analyze it or integrate it into the tradition. This already is apparent from two possible perspectives of looking at *Jubilees*, as one of the so-called Pseudepigrapha, or as part of the Dead Sea Scrolls collection. Scholars approach these corpora differently and so will have different expectations and assumptions when working with these texts. *Jubilees* as a pseudepigraph, transmitted as a literary unity in the Ethiopic church, and believed to closely reflect a Second Temple composition, is mainly approached as a literary work on its own, and the scholarly debate pertains to the internal consistency and contradictions within the work. Dead Sea Scrolls scholars, however, generally deal with different but associated fragmentary textual materials and therefore engage questions of relationships between fragments, manuscripts, and texts. These different perspectives also influence the way one envisages producers of texts. A focus on *Jubilees* as an independent and, to a smaller or larger extent, unified literary work, conjures up the figure of one or more individual authors, redactors, or compilers. In contrast, the comparison of differences and correspondences between the Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts, and the examination of processes of rewriting, turns the attention away from individual authors to ongoing scribal activity.

In the debate about the composition of *Jubilees*, the arguments about unity versus multiplicity play an important role. Whereas unity would be characterized at a minimum by consistency, or ideally, in a work of art, by organic coherence of all parts of the whole, multiplicity would be indicated by inconsistencies or even contradictions. Often, the unity of a work, or compositional unity, is associated with authorial

unity, based on the supposition that individual authors maintain a consistent thought and avoid contradictions in their work. Identified contradictions would therefore either indicate the use of sources, or betray post-authorial interventions, be they accidental (for example, by translators or inattentive copyists), or intentional (by redactors, editors, interpolators, etc.). But how useful is this concept of unity? Within this issue the contributors disagree about the identification of both unity and contradictions, and are even talking about different kinds of unity. For example, where Kugel sees a contradiction of ideas in *Jub.* 6, leading him to assign several verses to the interpolator, van Ruiten emphasizes the present unity of structure in that chapter. But, more importantly, the general assumption that compositional unity points to a single author (hence VanderKam's preference for the term "authorial unity") while contradictions indicate multiple individuals, cannot be taken as an exceptionless rule. Single-authored texts may contain different, or even contrasting, points of view; and unified compositions may be the final products of multiple scribes.

Scholars use many different terms for those producing ancient Jewish texts, depending on how the process is imagined: author, writer, editor, redactor, compiler, interpolator, scribe. While all scholars acknowledge that the person(s) who created the book of *Jubilees* used existing sources (some form of the books of Genesis and Exodus, as well as other written sources or traditions), the modern Western focus on the individual creative author of a work easily affects our conceptualization of this process. Thus, whereas many Dead Sea Scrolls fragments attest to the rewriting of texts and even the reassembling and expansion of materials, some scholars would assign most of this to the original work of one individual, whereas others would emphasize an ongoing process of writing and rewriting. Whether one speaks about authorship or rewriting depends on one's perspective.

The individual contributions to this issue differ with respect to the amount of attention they give either to the literary work of the book of *Jubilees*, or to individual texts and manuscripts. The understanding of the relationship between work, texts, and manuscripts may vary, however. The assumption of an original single-authored work (with or without subsequent interpolator) leads to the examination of all extant texts and manuscripts in order to ascertain how they reflect this work. In contrast, a focus on texts and manuscripts (however limited the material outside the Ethiopic), highlights the differences, and suggests a process of development, up to the point at which the Ethiopic textual tradition includes specifically Christian readings. The contributions to this issue deal with various points on this line of development, ranging from the study of the rewriting of older sources in the book

of *Jubilees*, through different scenarios of the possibly gradual formation of the book during the Second Temple period and the specific manuscript evidence from Qumran, to the importance of textual variants and its reception in the Ethiopic tradition.

We want to make an appeal for a progressive approach to composition history in the case of the book of *Jubilees*. All of the contributors to this volume are interested in how *Jubilees* came to be. To that extent, their approaches are retrospective: if we can reconstruct the single-authored harmonies from which the disharmonies of *Jubilees* were composed, we will understand what *Jubilees* was and what it became. Perhaps we can never fully determine the history of composition and the assumption that single-authored texts are harmonious and that harmonious texts are single-authored is false. But this does not challenge the views that we have a single-authored (VanderKam) or double-authored (Kugel) text. Instead of using contradictions to look backwards in the hope of finding sources, we can use them to look forward, to study the dynamic development of scriptural traditions. A text is like a movie. Just as it is possible to break the movie down into static frames, so we can break the text down into reconstructed sources. In some sense, the movie is composed out of frames, and the text is composed out of layers. But if we look only at the frames, separately, we will not understand the flow of the movie, let alone the connections that exist at a holistic level between this movie and other movies with which it is interacting. Similarly, if we look only for the sources of the text, we risk missing the flow of the text, which not only gives it unity as a text, but which also unites it with other scriptural texts that participate in the same creative process.

Hindy NAJMAN
Eibert TIGCHELAAR

JUBILEES AS THE COMPOSITION OF ONE AUTHOR?

Summary

The essay evaluates three recent hypotheses about subsequent modifications to the original text of the Book of Jubilees: (1) addition of eschatological texts (C. Berner), (2) interpolation of a series of passages (J. Kugel), and (3) addition of legal sections to pre-existing rewritten stories and encasing both types of material in a chronological framework (M. Segal). All three hypotheses as formulated by these scholars are found to be unconvincing, although the third in a reformulated way provides a more defensible account of the evidence.

IN the many studies written on the book of *Jubilees* since it became available in the West in 1850-51, most experts have proceeded from the conviction or at least on the assumption that the book came from one author. It was clear that the writer employed sources, since Genesis and part of Exodus served as a base for the book, but it was thought an author imposed his views and style on them so that they formed a unified composition. (1) Several scholars, however, have maintained that the book is not an authorial unity but shows the marks of an earlier text that was supplemented in some way. In this paper, I will examine some of the proposals that Jubilees is not from a single writer. I have not been convinced by any of them but have found some of the suggestions helpful in understanding how the book might have taken shape. For convenience sake, I will deal with a single representative of three different approaches to the issue, although—for the first two—other scholars will be mentioned (for the pertinent bibliography, see each of the sections below).

(1) See, for example, R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), xlv-xlvii.

1. Certain eschatological parts were added to a base text that did not prepare for them (Gene Davenport and Christoph Berner)
2. An editor or editors added a series of passages to correct the base text (Ernest Wiesenberg, Michel Testuz) or an interpolator has inserted many sections to alter or even contradict various elements in the base text (James Kugel).
3. The book consists of two parts: rewritten scriptural stories around which a writer/editor has wrapped (1) a chronological framework and to which he has attached (2) legal sections (Michael Segal). This proposal, which I find the most helpful generally, is not really like the others in that it could be understood as consistent with the unity of the book, though in a different way than that unity has traditionally been conceived (see below).

1. Certain eschatological parts were added to a base text that did not prepare for them:

Berner has resurrected a number of the points made by Davenport in 1971 and identified many of the same texts as coming from an editor or editors. (2) He argues that there is a strong difference between, on the one hand, the chronological framework in which the heptadic structure culminates in the occupation of the land and, on the other hand, the picture in 1:5-26 (or -28) where the text envisages a universal history. The structure of ch. 1 is such that vv. 1-4 (taken from Exodus) find their direct continuation in v. 29 where the angel of the presence, bearer of the heavenly tablets, is introduced; the implication is that the divine speech in vv. 5-26 (with vv. 27-28) does not belong to the original text. The speech of God concludes in his command that Moses write everything (v. 26) with all of history included. Verses 27-28 look to the same extended period as vv. 5-26; the difference here is that the climax is reached in the building of the eschatological temple on Mt. Zion—a motif that plays no role elsewhere in Jubilees. The second half of v. 29 is also an expansion in that it looks to the eschatological new creation. The beginning of v. 29 with its reference to law and testimony picks up these terms that appear in v. 4. Berner has to admit that the same two words—law and testimony—occur in v. 26, but he

(2) The summary is based on Christoph Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 239-54. He has also written a sketch of his views in “50 Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees,” *Hen* 31 (2009): 17-23. Gene Davenport published his theory about two redactors who modified an angelic discourse in *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (StPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

supposes that an editor took them from the base text. Finally, he finds that v. 4a is secondary, having been formed on the basis of v. 26a.

The result is that the original text of the chapter included just 1:1-3, 4b, 29a. These verses provide a narrative introduction describing the revelatory situation and a sketch of the contents: the division of times in their heptadic structure in relation to the law and testimony. The historical framework is from creation to Sinai as set forth in chaps. 2-50. The original text would have offered these contents (the underlined words are ones he regards as expansions within the Prologue and vv. 1-4, 29): (3)

These are the words regarding the divisions of the times of the law and of the testimony, of the events of the years, of the weeks of their jubilees throughout all the years of eternity as he related (them) to Moses on Mt. Sinai when he went up to receive the stone tablets—the law and the commandments—on the Lord’s orders as he had told him that he should come up to the summit of the mountain.

1:1 During the first year of the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt, in the third month—on the sixteenth of the month—the Lord said to Moses: “Come up to me on the mountain. I will give you the two stone tablets of the law and the commandments which I have written so that you may teach them.” 2 So Moses went up the mountain of the Lord. The glory of the Lord took up residence on Mt. Sinai, and a cloud covered it for six days. 3 When he summoned Moses into the cloud on the seventh day, he saw the glory of the Lord like a fire blazing on the summit of the mountain. 4 Moses remained on the mountain for 40 days and 40 nights while the Lord showed him what (had happened) beforehand as well as what was to come. He related to him the divisions of all the times—both of the law and of the testimony.

29 The angel of the presence, who was going along in front of the Israelite camp, took the tablets (which told) of the divisions of the years from the time the law and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until] the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, until the time when the temple of the Lord will be created in Jerusalem on Mt. Zion. All the luminaries will be renewed for (the purpose of) healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth.

(3) The translation is from VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), vol. 2.

A redactor turned this material into a universal history by inserting 1:5-26 and by expanding vv. 4 and 29 with an eschatological perspective. Another hand then expanded this text with references in vv. 27, 28, and 29 to the eschatological temple on Mt. Zion. As 4:26 also mentions Zion, it too is from this second hand. The first redactor slightly modified the Prologue where he added "throughout all the years of eternity." (4)

He next turns to Jubilees 23. Here vv. 1-8 (the death of Abraham) derive from Genesis, while vv. 9-13 contain material characteristic of Jubilees and the same is the case for v. 32. This leaves the intervening vv. 14-31. The section takes as its point of reference the motif of diminishing lifespans in vv. 9-13. To that theme vv. 14-31 add a historical survey with an eschatological perspective. The pattern found here fits the one in 1:5-26: sin, punishment, return, and eschatological salvation (though vv. 14-31 focus not on the history of Israel but on "the evil generation"). There is, however, a difference between 1:5-26 and 23:14-31: in the latter Israel's repentance unleashes a universal restitution in the eschaton, whereas there is nothing about this in 1:5-26. Yet both passages are expansions giving a deuteronomistically colored, universal historical perspective to texts that lacked it. He finds traces of the same hand in 50:5 (placed between the end of the original overview of history in v. 4 and the Sabbath section in 6-13, which was also part of the original text). The perspective in v. 5 is different: it looks to an unlimited sequence of jubilees; that is, it has the same eschatological perspective as chs. 1 and 23. There is a clear terminological connection between ch. 23 and 50:5 regarding a time of salvation without a satan or evil one (see 23:29), two passages from the same redactor.

The additions in chs. 1 and 23 make Israel's history in the Promised Land into the central theme; the heptadic system for the time period after the occupation will continue but it is not worked out in detail.

The approach defended by Berner and by Davenport before him isolates certain kinds of eschatological sections in the book and assigns them to an editor or two. There is no doubt that the sections identified by them look to a lengthy future well beyond the period covered in the book's historical survey, but the key question is: are these sections really incompatible with what the base text contains? True, their focus or emphasis is different, but why could the same writer not have composed all of them? It is odd, as commentators have long observed, that

(4) Berner supplies what he takes to be the *Grundschrift* in *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen*, 244-45.

a few verses in ch. 1 speak of all history while the vast bulk of the book deals with the period from creation to Sinai (and entry into the land). (5) Various proposals have been made to account for this (e.g., the original book must have been much longer), but perhaps for his purposes the writer chose to work out the heptadic chronology in detail only until the entry into the land. He had made his major points by doing that—the account he wrote was to serve as a testimony or warning to Israel—and through his chronological notes he identified the year in which the system of jubilees would begin in the land (50:4). His procedure, therefore, did not mean he thought his words had no application to a later time or that the jubilees system would no longer apply then. The sections isolated as editorial additions by Berner (and Davenport) are ones that map out implications of Jubilees' message for Israel and the world. Perhaps the author drew them from sources. Is there something about them that rules out identifying them as source-dependent rather than editorial modifications and how could one tell the difference? I should add that by chopping up ch. 1 in this way, there is no divine command to the angel of the presence to dictate the book to Moses—something the book really needs.

2. An editor or editors added a series of passages to correct the base text (Wiesenberg, (6) Testuz, (7) Kugel). I have examined the views of Wiesenberg (many revisions to the chronology) and Testuz (addition of three passages [1:7-25, 28; 23:11-32; 24:28b-30]—the first two largely overlap with units isolated by Davenport and Berner) elsewhere and found them unpersuasive. (8) They speak of revisions and additions, but Kugel has argued for the interference of an interpolator (he always capitalizes the word) in the text in twenty-nine passages,

(5) If we accept the theories of Davenport and Berner, we are left with a text containing a number of vague statements about all of time. Also, some of the passages they see as additions are present in Qumran copies, including the oldest one (4Q216). For example, col. II preserves parts of 1:7-15 and col. IV has words from 1:26-28. This would mean that, if they are additions, they were made at a very early time in the history of copying the book.

(6) "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RevQ* 3/9 (1961): 3-40.

(7) *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Paris: E. Droz, 1960).

(8) "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *JSS* 26 (1981): 209-17; "The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. L. Lidonnici and A. Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 267-84; "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *CBR* 6 (2008): 410-16; and "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees," in J. C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 522-44.

most of which are conveniently marked by references to the heavenly tablets or at least language characteristic of the tablets. (9)

Kugel credits Liora Ravid with identifying the special language used for these tablets, although in her essay Ravid attributes the sections to the author of the book (the only addition she posits for Jubilees is 50:6-13 where “tablets” but not “heavenly tablets” occurs so it is not in Kugel’s list). (10) Kugel believes that his interpolator found it very disturbing that some of the laws given at Sinai (e.g., for the festivals) originated in spontaneous actions by a patriarch. The interpolator thought such laws had to come from God in the first place, and he expresses this conviction by inserting passages that report the laws were written on the heavenly tablets from the beginning. They did not start as spontaneous actions by human beings. Also, for the interpolator festival dates could not be fixed by human counting—not even the date for the Festival of Weeks. He says about his interpolator: “This new writer’s material—usually only a few sentences here and there, and usually dealing with some biblical law—sometimes complemented, but also sometimes contradicted, the narrative *and* legal passages penned by the original author.” (11) The interpolated passages show a common purpose and ideology that differ from those of the author.

Although I have examined the arguments for all the passages that Kugel attributes to an interpolator and am convinced by not a single one of them, I will here present two examples and indicate how, in my estimation, his arguments for assigning them to an interpolator are flawed. At the outset it should be said, however, that his central contention that in the material from the author spontaneous actions of a patriarch become the basis for a law in the Torah is highly dubious. Jubilees 1 and other passages leave the strong impression that events are determined beforehand, and in specific cases explicit heavenly guidance is what leads to a patriarchal action which is hardly, therefore,

(9) He introduced his hypothesis in “On the Interpolations in the *Book of Jubilees*,” *RevQ* 94 (2009): 215-72. That material appeared in a similar form in his essay “The Contradictions in the *Book of Jubilees*” in idem, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 227-96 (several other essays in the book also deal with the topic). He also writes about the interpolator in the course of his commentary on the book in the first part of *A Walk through Jubilees* (pp. 1-205) and also in his commentary “*Jubilees*,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture* (ed. L. Feldman, J. Kugel, and L. Schiffman; 3 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1.272-465. Since his most sustained statements for the hypothesis appear in “On the Interpolations” and “The Contradictions,” references are supplied to them in the notes.

(10) “The Special Terminology of the Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 463-71 [Hebrew].

(11) “On the Interpolations,” 219.

spontaneous (see, for instance, Jub. 16:10-19 as the context for Abraham's celebration of the first Festival of Tabernacles in vv. 20-31).

One of Kugel's examples concerns the presentations of the Day of Atonement in chs. 5 and 34; the first (5:13-18) comes from his interpolator and the second (34:18-19) from the author. (12) The evidence that they do not come from the same hand, apart from mention of the heavenly tablets in 5:13, is that they supposedly provide two different etiologies and two differing explanations for the day. According to 5:13-18 (all from the interpolator), it is a day for Israel to turn from sins in the proper way so that God will forgive them, whereas according to 34:15-19 (from the author) it is a day for Israel to be sad for their sins. There clearly are not two etiologies for the day: ch. 5 mentions the future institution of the Day of Atonement (note, it is for the Israelites, not all the post-flood generations) and the role of repentance; ch. 34 speaks about the origin of the day and remorse for wrongdoings. The writer speaks about the Day of Atonement twice and does so in a consistent fashion, with neither section tied more closely to the Torah than the other. There is no convincing evidence for an interpolator in 5:13-18, which like 34:12-19 is from the author of the book.

An example to which Kugel devotes a lengthy argument (13) and one that deals with an important topic in Jubilees—the Festival of Weeks—should serve to show that his arguments do not lead to the inference that an interpolator was at work in Jubilees.

He finds two interpolations in Jubilees 6. The author of Jubilees recounted the post-flood events pretty much as Genesis does but, as several scholars have noted, he innovated by making Noah's sacrifice a part of a covenantal ceremony. The covenant involved the blood prohibition as a condition placed on Noah and his offspring. This covenant dates to the first day of the third month (Jub. 6:1).

The first interpolation is 6:10-14: Its "overall purpose was to combat something in the Torah that the Interpolator found highly disturbing: the idea that the date of the Festival of Weeks (*Šabu'ot*) was

(12) "The Interpolations," 230-33; *A Walk through Jubilees*, 56 and 167; "The Contradictions," 235-40. It is not easy to understand how Kugel can write about 34:18-19: "There, the Day of Atonement has quite a different character: it is a day of mourning, but repentance plays no part in it" (*A Walk through Jubilees*, 56). Note that the writer mentions being distressed for their sins (v. 18) and being saddened for their sins so that they may purify themselves (v. 19), both of which seem concerned with repentance.

(13) "The Interpolations," 241-48; "The Contradictions," 248-56; see also *A Walk through Jubilees*, 59-69. Apparently it was not disturbing to this hypothetical interpolator that humans had to count the days in the 364-day calendar so that the festivals could be celebrated at the right times.

to be determined each year by human beings counting off a series of seven weeks” (14) It is worth noting here that, though he makes the point frequently, Kugel identifies no passage where this great concern of the interpolator with a human role in identifying the date of sacred festivals comes to expression. In addition, the point is irrelevant in Jubilees where the Festival of Weeks is on a fixed day determined by using the givens in Lev 23:15-16. In this first interpolation, the words “heavenly tablets” do not appear but a few other expressions commonly used with “the heavenly tablets” do. The text speaks about an oath sworn by Noah and his sons—an oath not mentioned in Genesis. As others have noted, it permits a verbal play between *Šabu‘ot* (weeks) and *Šebu‘ot* (oaths).

The second interpolation is in 6:17-19 (here the heavenly tablets are mentioned). As he quotes Jubilees at this point Kugel alters what the Ethiopic text (the only surviving version for the passage) calls the holiday—the “Festival of Weeks”—to “Festival of Oaths,” though he does put Oaths in brackets. The text of Jubilees in fact never refers to a Festival of Oaths. (15) Kugel explains: “The interpolation begins ‘For this reason’ (presumably על כן), but once again, it really has nothing to do with what the original author had just said about the rainbow as a sign of God’s covenant. Rather, it is a quite unrelated assertion that Noah’s covenant is to be ‘renewed’ each and every year by means of a special festival, the ‘Festival of Weeks/Oaths.’” (16) It is difficult to see how this is “quite unrelated” to what has gone before. The preceding text dealt with the covenant of which the rainbow was a marker; the next paragraph, quite logically, deals with the renewal of that covenant as an annual reminder.

The biblical legislation for the Festival of Weeks involves counting off seven weeks from the waving of the Omer and celebrating the holiday on the next day. “But to the Interpolator, the whole idea of human beings having some role in determining the date of one of God’s holy days must have seemed horrible.” (17) Where Jubilees warns about people who will observe the moon and use it as the basis for calculating the length of the year, Kugel says that for the interpolator “this procedure must have seemed altogether wrong—and to have human

(14) “The Interpolations,” 242 = “The Contradictions,” 250.

(15) The two words would be identical in an unpointed Hebrew text, but it remains the case that the only name given to the festival in a copy of Jubilees is “the Festival of Weeks.”

(16) “The Interpolations,” 244-45; “The Contradictions,” 252.

(17) “The Interpolations,” 245 = “The Contradictions,” 252. The human role of which he speaks would, of course, consist only in following the divine instructions for determining the date of the festival, ones found in the Torah.

beings determine the date of the Festival of Weeks by counting off weeks could hardly have looked any better to him.” (18) On what this last part of the sentence is based is a mystery. The writer objects to those who make the year ten days too short by basing their calculations on lunar phenomena, but he does not refer to those who, in obedience to Lev 23:15-16, count the seven weeks for determining the date of the Festival of Weeks. In Jubilees, because of its 364-day calendar, the date for that festival was fixed. Neither in Jubilees nor in the Torah does a human “determine” the date of a sacred festival; they are fixed by revelation in both, though contemporaries of the author argued, in the case of the Festival of Weeks, about what the revelation meant. But to assert that Jub. 6:37-38 somehow implies that the calculations for identifying the proper date of the Festival of Weeks are no better than the lunar observations the writer actually condemns is to make the text assert or even imply something quite other than what it says.

As Kugel understands the situation, the interpolator solved the problem with human counting and also highlighted the blood prohibition by representing the Festival of Weeks as the Festival of Oaths, that is, as a commemoration of the oath sworn by Noah and his sons. Since it was a festival of oaths, not weeks, no human counting was needed. Kugel points out that his interpolator never mentions such counting; the festival was celebrated in heaven before Noah’s time when no human counting could have been involved. He should have added that the author too does not refer to counting in what Kugel regards as original parts of the book.

Kugel goes on to argue that in the Bible, the Festival of Weeks has nothing to do with Noah’s covenant (or any other). It was an agricultural festival, and that is the way the author of Jubilees understood it. Abram set the precedent for it in 15:1-2 where he celebrated the Festival of the First Fruits of the wheat harvest. Kugel finds in Jubilees two precedents for two different festivals: one was Noah’s festival associated with the oath; nothing is said about first fruits in connection with it, and it occurred on the first of the third month. The other was Abram’s first fruits festival on the fifteenth of the third month. The bold step taken by the interpolator was to assert “that the Festival of Oaths (*Sebu’ot*) had originally been an entirely separate festival from that of First Fruits—they had two names in the Bible because, at first, they were quite unrelated.” (19)

(18) “The Interpolations,” 245; the language is different in “The Contradictions,” 253: “... determining the date of the Festival of Weeks by having human beings count off weeks can hardly have seemed acceptable.”

(19) “The Interpolations,” 246; “The Contradictions,” 254.

If his argument thus far fails to convince, the facts of the text become even more resistant to the interpolator theory. Kugel asserts: "Indeed, even Abraham had kept the two separately; the Interpolator was careful to insert a brief mention that, in addition to inaugurating First Fruits, Abraham had also 'renewed the festival [of Oaths] and the ordinance for himself forever' (Jub. 14:20b)." (20) What we should notice here are a couple of facts: (1) Abram is celebrating the Festival of Weeks there as it is explicitly dated to the middle of the third month and explicitly separated from a different event on the first of the third month (when the Lord appeared to Abram); and (2) in 14:20b there is no linguistic marker that identifies the passage as coming from the interpolator, and it opposes Kugel's theory about two separate festivals. For Jubilees there is just one, as the writer makes clear. In what strikes me as a very peculiar way of reading Jub. 6:20-22, where the text follows the Pentateuch in identifying the festival as of two kinds—a festival of weeks and a festival of first fruits—Kugel claims that the interpolator is explaining that the two originally separate festivals were fused at Sinai. As he puts it, "Here, clearly, these two originally separate third-month festivals are to be combined," that is, celebrated as in the Pentateuch. (21)

Another difficulty for Kugel's theory arises in Jub. 22:1: "Isaac and Ishmael came from the well of the oath to their father Abraham to celebrate the festival of weeks (this is the festival of the firstfruits of the harvest)." The verse clearly, like 6:21, opposes the notion that these are two separate festivals, and it should, along with 14:20b, be added to the evidence that his thesis about the festival is contrary to the facts, but it is dismissed as "one small but telling error" (22) made by the interpolator. It is more likely that Kugel, not an interpolator, is guilty of making a mistake here. The passage is from the author of the book who is consistent in the ways in which he refers to the single Festival of Weeks that he, along with the Bible, also calls the festival of the new wheat.

These are just two examples and others could be adduced, but they illustrate the sorts of arguments and claims that expose the interpolator hypothesis as an unconvincing reading of Jubilees.

3. The book consists of two parts: rewritten scriptural stories around which a writer/editor has wrapped (1) a chronological framework and to which he has attached (2) legal sections (Segal). (23)

(20) "The Interpolations," 247 = "The Contradictions," 254.

(21) "The Interpolations," 247 = "The Contradictions," 255.

(22) "The Interpolations," 248 = "The Contradictions," 256.

(23) *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007). See also "Narrative and Law in the Book of Jubilees:

Segal maintains that the person who put the book of Jubilees together was not the author of the reworked stories in it. They existed before Jubilees came into being and were incorporated into it. The compiler of the book was the person who attached the chronology and legal sections to the pre-existing rewritten stories. So one person compiled the book by supplementing existing rewritten narratives with legal material and enclosing everything in a chronological structure. The theory implies that the author/compiler did less than experts have generally credited him with doing. No one has doubted that the writer of Jubilees used some pre-existing rewritings of scriptural sections—the presentation of Gen 6:1-4 as understood in the Book of the Watchers is a familiar example; others could be the Levi sections (chs. 30-32), the Amorite War (34:2-9), and the like. Segal's argument is that this was the case throughout the book—something that is possible but goes beyond the evidence presently available, as many of Jubilees' rewritings of stories from Genesis-Exodus are known from no earlier sources.

How can one tell that the compiler did not compose the rewritten stories? One could surely imagine that one person put together all three types of material—rewritten stories, chronology, and legal parts. Contradictions and conflicts between the stories and the legal sections and/or the chronology provide the evidence for Segal. That the instances he cites are in fact contradictions or conflicts seems to me unlikely.

One of the sections Segal treats in analyzing what he calls "The Halakhic Redaction" is the story about Reuben and Bilhah in Jubilees 33. (24) He finds a conflict regarding Bilhah's legal status between 33:1-9a (the rewritten narrative) and 33:9b-20 (the legal section). The narrative pictures her as entirely innocent, while in the legal part the law cited (particularly Lev 20:11) requires that both the man and the woman in the illicit sexual relationship be put to death. There is no doubt that according to the legal section, once the law was revealed, such was the case. But Segal thinks Jub. 33:15 says that Bilhah too was to die although that did not happen. (25) He follows the translation of Charles: "And let them not say: to Reuben was granted life and forgiveness after he had lain with his father's concubine, and to

A New Look at the Story of the Entry into the Garden of Eden," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 111-25 [Hebrew]; "The Relationship between the Legal and Narrative Passages in *Jubilees*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 203-28; "The Story of Shechem and Dinah in *Jubilees* 30," *Meghillot* 8 (2010): 227-41 [Hebrew].

(24) *The Book of Jubilees*, 73-82. Kugel also includes the passage among the "contradictions" in Jubilees ("The Contradictions," 228-29).

(25) *The Book of Jubilees*, 78-79 n. 20.

her also though she had a husband, and her husband Jacob, his father, was still alive.” That is, the opponents quoted in v. 15 would be saying that Bilhah too received life and forgiveness, and if she obtained forgiveness she must have done something that needed forgiving. She was not innocent as she definitely is in the story. He claims that the syntactical structure here is the same as in v. 10: “They are certainly to die together—the man who lies with his father’s wife and the woman too....” However, he misinterprets v. 15 where the name *Reuben* is preceded by the preposition *la-* (“to Reuben”) (26) while the name *Bilhah* lacks a preposition paralleling the one with Reuben. This favors understanding the sentence in the way I have translated it: “They are not to say: ‘Reuben was allowed to live and (have) forgiveness after he had slept with the concubine-wife of his father while she had a husband and her husband—his father Jacob—was alive.’” The latter part of the sentence indicates two conditions that characterized the situation. The support Segal finds from v. 10 is non-existent since it lacks a parallel to *la(-robēl)* in v. 15. The legal section and the rewritten story are not in conflict on this point.

Similar objections may be made to his arguments about conflicts between rewritten stories and the chronology around them. Segal’s concern is not with conflicts within the chronology itself but ones between a story that the compiler took from elsewhere and the chronology that he imposed on it. If his analysis is correct, we would have to suppose that a person much taken by chronology (the compiler of Jubilees) did not notice the problems he was causing or for some reason did not alter the stories so they harmonized with his chronology. Serious questions can be raised about the examples Segal cites.

One of them comes from the section about the naming/birth (27) of Jacob’s many children in Jubilees 28. For the first five sons in the list, Segal thinks, Jubilees contains a contradiction between two exegetical approaches to the section about the births of the children in Gen 29:31-30:24: (1) taking the unit as a single chronological sequence for their births, or (2) assuming that more than one wife was pregnant/bearing children at the same time. Since Dan (#5, born in the year 2127 [Jub. 28:18]) was born before Judah (#4, born in 2129 [28:15]) according to the dates in Jubilees, it looks as if the compiler has taken the second (overlapping pregnancies) approach in his chronology.

(26) The Ethiopic version is again the only one preserved for the verse.

(27) For each child, Genesis mentions the birth, but Jubilees refers to the birth and gives the date when the child was named. Presumably that date was also the birth date.

That is, his mother Bilhah was bearing children at the same time as Leah, the mother of the first four, was doing so. Nevertheless, the text of Jubilees retains the order in which the sons were born in Genesis (Judah as the fourth, Dan as the fifth) as if the births were in sequence (this would be the rewritten story part). The instance of Judah/Dan seems a strong case because the chronology (the birth dates) contradicts the statement in 28:17 that Dan's birth followed those of Leah's first four sons (Judah is the fourth). "The rewritten story therefore clearly contradicts the dates in the chronological framework, as the addition to the biblical narrative in v. 17 explicitly establishes that Jacob's first four sons were born before Bilhah was given to Jacob." (28) He draws a similar conclusion from the chronological problem with Issachar relative to the overall sequence taken from Genesis.

Segal devotes some attention to textual solutions that have been proposed to address the problem, that is, to suggestions that scribal confusions with numbers led to the discrepancies in the text. One proponent of this approach, Hermann Rönsch, had, according to Segal, a "preconceived notion that the chronological data and rewritten stories are indeed completely consistent." (29) Such an approach, he argues, fails to take into consideration the pattern for expressing dates in Jubilees: each year is given in triple numbers—jubilee, week, and year in the week. "In this system, a successive date does not repeat any information that is already contained in its predecessor." (30) So a jubilee, week, or year is mentioned "only when it differs from that of the preceding date." (31) As a result, one cannot correct just a single number to fix a chronological problem; one has to offer a correction that is consistent with the pattern the author uses for dates. But Segal's assertion about the pattern of dates in Jubilees is inaccurate. A good counter-example appears in this very unit: in Jub. 28:19-24 "fourth week" is mentioned in six consecutive year dates. Under such circumstances, it would be valid to maintain that individual numbers became confused and to propose corrections for them.

In light of the fact that the book uses more than one pattern, Segal's conclusion from the Dan/Issachar problems is surprising and radical:

(28) Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 88.

(29) Ibid., 89. He is referring to Rönsch's *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [P. Riesland], 1874), 327-31.

(30) Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 90.

(31) Ibid.

In my opinion, the necessary [!] conclusion from the contradiction between the chronological details and the rewritten story is not that the text is corrupt (as suggested by Rönsch), but that ch. 28 developed through a complex literary process. The chronological editor of *Jubilees* copied a rewritten story, which reflected a specific approach to understanding the order of the births (v. 17), and superimposed a chronological framework upon this base that reflected a different approach to the interpretation of the biblical story (vv. 15, 18). Any attempt to resolve the tension between the two will necessarily [!] fail, because the two approaches reflect two exegetical traditions arising from two different sources. (32)

One could begin critiquing Segal's analysis by asking questions like: why would anyone do something so odd as to impose a chronological framework on stories it does not fit? Would a person so focused on chronology as we see in the writer of *Jubilees* not notice the point that modern students of the text have repeatedly highlighted? And why should one opt for such a far-reaching conclusion as assigning chronology and rewritten story to different writers when, in this case which seems to be his major one, only one date is out of order, possibly two in a lengthy sequence of them? It is hardly, as he puts it, a "necessary" inference. It would be better to search for a simpler solution, especially given how badly numbers can be mangled in manuscript transmission. All one has to do is look at the Latin translation for these verses to see that confusions and mistakes could arise.

If one takes the more economical approach of assuming errors involving individual numbers have slipped into the text—the Hebrew fragments from Qumran document that this happened elsewhere in *Jubilees* (33)—the following proposal may be advanced, one that closely resembles the hypothesis of R. H. Charles. (34) If there were eleven births in somewhat less than a twelve-year period and on no occasion was more than one mother pregnant, there would not be many years left without a birth. In context, the problematic entries for Judah/Dan and Asher/Issachar would read: (35)

(32) *Ibid.*, 91.

(33) At Jub. 22:1, where the Ethiopic text refers to the forty-fourth jubilee, 4QJub^d (4Q219) col. II 35 has the (correct) forty-third jubilee.

(34) *Jubilees*, 171. The chart presented here eliminates the inconsistencies that have crept into his list (e.g., the date for Naphtali he gives as 2131 when it should be 2130 as he notes in the margin of his translation on p. 173).

(35) In the chart, A.M. = anno mundi, brackets indicate a number implied in the text but not explicit; italics indicate emended numbers.

Name (passage)	day	month	year	week	A.M.
Reuben (28:11)	14	9	1	3	2122
Simeon (28:13)	21	10	3	[3]	2124
Levi (28:14)	1	1	6	[3]	2127
Judah (28:15) (36)	15	3	7	[3]	2128
Dan (28:18)	9	6	1	4	2129
Naphtali (28:19)	5	7	2	4	2130
Gad (28:20)	12	8	3	4	2131
Asher (28:21)	2	11	4	4	2132
Issachar (28:22) (37)	4	5	5	4	2133

It may be that the year and week numbers for Judah and Dan simply got switched in transmission; also, if numerals were used, it would be easy to understand how for Dan year 7 [in week 3] became year 6 [in week 3] (the numbers in the Ethiopic text) through the interchange of 7 and 6. A similar, accidental switch of dates for Asher and Issachar would account for the problem with them.

Plausible mistakes like these allow one to account for the data about the births/namings of the children without having to resort to a major theory about a literary separation between the chronology in Jubilees and the stories it is meant to organize.

I believe that the three hypotheses sketched above fail to offer compelling challenges to the authorial unity of Jubilees. The failure of these hypotheses does not, of course, mean the book is from one writer. To establish that point would require a series of demonstrations showing a consistency of thought, purpose, and procedure throughout the book. I am intrigued by Segal's suggestion about the different kinds of materials and what may have come from the person who compiled the book of Jubilees. He posits that a compiler added to existing rewritten stories a chronology and legal units that in places conflict with those stories. Even if there are no contradictions between them (as I believe),

(36) In the Ethiopic text (28:15) Judah is named on the fifteenth of the third month in the first year of week four (= 2129).

(37) In the Ethiopic version, the dates for Asher are the second of month eleven in the fifth year of the fourth week (= 2133); for Issachar they are the fourth day of the fifth month, in the fourth year of the fourth week (= 2132). See Jub. 28:21-22.

it could still be the case that there was a compiler of the sort Segal envisions. If the person we think of as the author of Jubilees supplied the legal and chronological materials and took over rewritten stories from elsewhere, we would have to say he imposed his stamp on those stories as well.

James VANDERKAM

THE COMPOSITIONAL HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF *JUBILEES*

Summary

The author of *Jubilees* chose to write a retelling of the book of Genesis precisely because its events are all situated before the great revelation of divine law at Mount Sinai. His central argument was that Israel had been bound to God long before Sinai: in his retelling, God had chosen Israel as His special people on the sixth day of Creation, and various ancestors of the people of Israel had been tied by covenants to God and had kept various laws (including those connected with the biblical festivals and other holy days) well before the Sinai revelation. He thus sought to argue that, even if Israel had violated the Sinai covenant and had subsequently been exiled, this hardly spelled the end of Israel's special status as God's own people.

Sometime after the completion of the original book, an interpolator inserted a number of passages that sought to correct what he considered an objectionable element in the original, the implication that some of the Torah's laws had originated in practices adopted by Israel's ancestors on their own initiative. "Not so!" he claimed; long before the time of those ancestors, those divine laws had been inscribed on high in the "Heavenly Tablets."

IN the following I wish to offer a brief overview of the book of *Jubilees*, one that will seek to explore some of its most distinctive features and what they imply about the book's process of composition.

Nature and Purpose of the Book

The book of *Jubilees* is an expansive retelling of the narratives of Genesis and the first part of the book of Exodus. It is expansive in that it adds all sorts of details to the biblical narratives that it retells, sometimes also rearranging the order of events or inserting whole new incidents into the text—all this in order to resolve perceived

contradictions or ambiguities in the original biblical narrative. In addition, *Jubilees* often provides the date on which an event narrated in Genesis occurred; these dates are calculated from the time of the creation of the world, with the total number of years presented in terms of 49-year units (“jubilees”). (1) The dating then further specifies in which “week” (a unit of seven years) within the jubilee the event occurred, and often also identifies the exact year of the event’s occurrence within that “week.” This dating of various events in Genesis is one of the book’s most striking features.

Not all of *Jubilees* is, even in this broad sense, exegetical. The author also includes passages that serve no exegetical purpose: some of these additions fall under the general heading of paraenesis—speeches in which Noah, Abraham, Rebekah and other biblical figures hold forth on the proper path to follow in life. Still other parts of the book deal with biblical festivals and other material never mentioned in the book of Genesis. In short, *Jubilees* is part biblical commentary, part a chronological ordering of events, and part pure invention of items quite unrelated to the book of Genesis. (2) Yet, despite this apparent variety, the book does have a clear purpose that is served by all the elements mentioned.

The book itself offers a number of clues as to its overall aim. The first concerns the great revelation of divine law at Mount Sinai. Throughout most of the Second Temple period, the laws revealed at Sinai, along with their proper interpretation and application, were of great importance to Jews of all stripes. Thus, the Qumran texts are full of legal material, from the *Temple Scroll* to 4QMMT (*Halakhic Letter*) and beyond; a bit later, the Alexandrian Philo sought to discuss the

(1) The length of a jubilee is ambiguous in the Pentateuch: see Lev 25:8 (49 years), and 25:10 (50 years). While *Jubilees* generally follows the former, one apparent exception is found in *Jub.* 4:21. This verse, in restating Gen 5:22 (“Enoch walked with God 300 years”), says that Enoch was with God “for six jubilees of years,” implying that a jubilee lasts 50 years rather than 49. (Note also that the Hebrew phrase ששה יובלי שנים, while not found among the Qumran fragments of *Jubilees* itself, appears in 4Q227 *Pseudo-Jubilees* [4QpsJub^c] 2:2, in apparent reference to Enoch’s years in heaven.) See on this J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 27; D. Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 14–29. It may be that *Jubilees*’ author uncritically repeated a conventional reference to Enoch’s time in heaven without realizing that it contradicted the 49-year rule. See also Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSupp 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 16–17, 84–85.

(2) This combination of materials has led to much speculation about the generic affiliations of the book; see recently John J. Collins, “The Genre of the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. Eric F. Mason et al.; 2 vols.; JSJSupp 153; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 2:737–55.

laws of the Torah at length in a series of treatises, as Josephus apparently intended to do as well; (3) divine law was hardly insignificant to the first Christians; and it would be superfluous to mention the legal focus of our oldest rabbinic texts.

One might thus begin by asking why *Jubilees'* author should have chosen to write a book about Israel's forebears (including Moses) that makes virtually no mention of the Sinai revelation, indeed, a book that arranges for its historical narrative to stop just short of Sinai. Sinai ought to have been its great conclusion! Stranger still is the book's consistent down-playing of at least some of those Sinai laws, at one point thumbing its nose, as it were, at the Pentateuch's laws of ritual purity and impurity. (4) (The only thing resembling impurity that seems to count for *Jubilees'* author is the corruption that results from זנות, "fornication," or from contact with non-Jews.) (5)

(3) See *Ant.* 20.268, where Josephus mentions a planned four-volume work on "the opinions that we Jews hold concerning God and His essence, as well as concerning the laws, that is, why according to them we are permitted to do some things while we are forbidden to do others."

(4) Liora Ravid observed that *Jubilees'* author actually arranged his retelling of events so as to have Jacob sleep next to his grandfather Abraham the night that the latter dies, thereby contracting the most serious degree of ritual impurity. This is an episode that the author of *Jubilees* makes up out of whole cloth, with no Scriptural support or apparent exegetical purpose. Yet the text makes no mention of Jacob's subsequent impurity, nor does it ever say that he underwent ritual purification: see L. Ravid, "Purity and Impurity in the Book of *Jubilees*," *JSP* 13 (2002): 61-86. James VanderKam's attempted refutation of her argument (that purity laws did not exist in the absence of a temple) does not address the basic question: why did *Jubilees'* author invent this incident when it had no Scriptural support and served no evident purpose? See J. C. VanderKam, "Viewed from Another Angle: Purity and Impurity in the Book of *Jubilees*," *JSP* 13 (2002): 209-15. Indeed, the author's only mention of a purity law (in *Jub.* 3:8, referring to Lev 12:1-5, concerning impurity after childbirth) is made solely in order to justify the author's explanation of the apparent contradiction between Gen 1:27 (God created humanity, "male and female" on the sixth day of creation) and the subsequent narrative of Eve's later creation in Gen 2:21-22. See J. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees* (JSJSupp 156; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 37-38, 230-32.

(5) See in general J. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford, 2000); on Gentiles in *Jubilees*, note pp. 48-49. Cf. the imputation to Egyptians and Canaanites (typological non-Jews) of sexual corruption in Lev 18:3-4, 24-25. Numerous scholars have sought to characterize *Jubilees'* stand on the dangers of contact with non-Jews. See M. Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Inter-marriage at the Time of Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1-24; L. Ravid, "Purity and Impurity"; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 130-32; Christine Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identity: Inter-marriage and Conversion, from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. 73-81; W. R. G. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 113-284; Susan Haber, "They Shall Purify Themselves": *Essays on Purity in Early Judaism* (ed. Adele Reinhartz;

What is more—and more to the point—the author of *Jubilees* sought to attribute many of the laws promulgated at Sinai to earlier practices of Israel's ancestors—Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. These men had, according to *Jubilees*, created precedents for the festivals of Booths (סוכות) and Weeks (שבועות), the Day of Atonement, the law of fourth-year produce (נטע רבעי) and other things—long before Sinai. In these matters as well, the book as a whole seems most eager to diminish the importance of the Sinai revelation, suggesting that, in such matters, that revelation was merely a public proclamation of practices that had in fact long been in use.

The reason for all these features is, I believe, directly tied to the time in which the author lived. Scholars generally agree that the book of *Jubilees* was written sometime in the second century B.C.E., with some researchers dating it toward the beginning of that century, others later on. (6) For the present purpose, it matters little whether the book is dated early or late; whatever the precise time of composition, there can be little doubt that this was a period when some Jews were questioning the most basic beliefs of their ancestral religion, indeed, abandoning those beliefs in favor of another, quite different, ideology and way of life—Hellenism.

Hellenism—that is, Greek civilization and its way of life, including its political, philosophical, scientific and other achievements, as well as their embodiment in actual Greek-style cities and societies at various locations in the ancient world—was a most impressive phenomenon, known and honored far and wide. Its openness to non-Greeks as well as its achievements, material no less than intellectual, had proven attractive to many different peoples. What then was the point for Judeans to hold on to their own very local and parochial traditions

EJL 24; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 57-58; Lutz Doering, "Purity and Impurity in the Book of *Jubilees*," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 261-75; D. W. Suter, "Jubilees, the Temple, and the Aaronite Priesthood," in *ibid.*, 397-410.

(6) There are strong arguments against the late second-century dating. What is apparently the oldest fragment of *Jubilees* found at Qumran, columns V-VII of 4Q216, has been dated paleographically to the last quarter of the second century B.C.E., though Jozef Milik preferred to date the script nearer to the middle of the second century B.C.E.: see J. VanderKam and J. Milik, "Jubilees," in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Harold Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 2. Given this dating and presuming that the Qumran fragment is not the author's autograph copy, one should situate the time of the book's composition no later than the middle of the second century. But there are good reasons to put it considerably earlier. For my own view, see J. Kugel, "The Figure of Moses in *Jubilees*," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1 (2012): 77-92, esp. 79-80 note 2.

about their God and His care for His people—a deity alleged to control the entire world? The people’s own history argued against such beliefs. If indeed the God of heaven had adopted Israel as His special treasure (as is recounted in Exod 19:5-6), that day was now long past. In the meantime, that same God had apparently allowed the Northern Kingdom of Israel to fall to the Assyrians, never to rise again; the Southern Kingdom, Judah, had similarly fallen to the Babylonians, and much of its citizenry had been exiled to Babylon. True, unlike the Northerners, the Judean exiles had subsequently been allowed to return to their homeland, but they were nonetheless a subject people, ruled over first by Persia, then Ptolemaic Egypt, and subsequently by Seleucid Syria. Was this a fitting arrangement for a people allegedly chosen by the ruler of heaven and earth? Instead, the likeliest explanation was that God’s adoption of Israel as His own people, an act inaugurated with the great covenant at Mount Sinai, must no longer be in force. Israel had violated that covenant—first the Northerners, then the Southerners—and had therefore been rejected; the apparently unending years of foreign domination were a clear indication that Israel had fallen into God’s disfavor.

It was principally to combat any such reading of history that the author of *Jubilees* wrote his book. He began by having Moses hear a “prediction” of all the evils that would lead up to the Babylonian exile, the same predictions found in the book of Deuteronomy (see *Jub.* 1:9-14). This was to be a terrible catastrophe, Moses is told, but it would ultimately be followed by Israel’s repentance and restoration (*Jub.* 1:15), and the explicit reversal of the Pentateuch’s own curses that were said to be Israel’s lot if it violated the Sinai covenant (*Jub.* 1:16). In other words, *Jubilees*’ author readily accepted that Israel had sinned and was punished—but this hardly spelled the end of its historic bond with its God. Israel was, and always had been, God’s own people.

This was, for *Jubilees*’ author, the great message carried by the book of Genesis—and the reason why he chose a retelling of its stories as the ideal instrument for communicating his theme. Genesis is, after all, full of accounts of God’s dealings with Israel’s remote ancestors, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, and Jacob and his wives and children. These stories all give evidence of the close connection between God and Israel’s forebears; they not only interact directly with God, but God rewards them—most tangibly in the grant of the land of Canaan to them and their descendants. The Torah itself mentions legal *covenants* that bound Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham to God forever, and asserts that He would remember these covenants even after the people had been exiled “to the land of their enemies” (Lev 26:41-42). For the author of *Jubilees*, all this was proof positive that God’s

adoption of Israel did not begin at Mount Sinai, as one might assume from a straightforward reading of Exod 19:5-6, but that it had begun long before—going back, *Jubilees* asserted, to the very first sabbath in history (the one that immediately followed the six days of the creation), when God decided to create Israel as His people (*Jub.* 2:19-20). (7)

The covenants concluded with Abraham in Gen 15 and 17, along with the promises made to Jacob in Gen 28:13-14, were thus not, as it might seem, merely intended as a grant of the land of Canaan, nor yet a vague pledge of numerous descendants, but an eternal alliance. They, no less than the Sinai covenant, bound Israel to its God forever. To say this likewise implied a definite diminution of the importance of the Sinai covenant itself. It was not the first and sole basis of the alliance between God and Israel, but only one covenant among several; its violation, therefore, could hardly have occasioned a definitive rupture between the two parties. So yes, Israel had failed to keep the conditions of the Sinai covenant, a sin for which it had been duly punished through the Babylonian conquest and exile. But once punished, the child is forgiven. Whatever the political ups and downs that had subsequently characterized Israel's history, there could be no doubt that God's alliance with Israel was still in effect and would continue eternally.

This was, I believe, the basic message of comfort that the author of *Jubilees* wished to communicate, and in retelling Genesis, he sought to give it concrete expression. Thus, as mentioned, God's choice of Israel as His people was moved back from Exodus 19 to the seventh day of the creation (based in part on the divine assertion in Exod 4:22 that Israel was God's "firstborn son"). (8) The author also went to the trouble of having Israel's remote ancestors worship God in much the same way as they were to worship Him after Sinai. True, there was no temple or tabernacle in pre-Sinai times, indeed, no established priesthood. But Genesis did mention that various patriarchs had built altars and offered sacrifices to God. With this slim bit of evidence to support him, the author of *Jubilees* asserted that a chain of priests had in fact existed from earliest times—one priest at a time—and that these priests were in every sense continuous with the later, Levitical priesthood. Thus, Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Levi are

(7) Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 315.

(8) See J. Kugel, "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation," *DSD* 5 (1998): 119-48; L. Doering, "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of *Jubilees*," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179-205.

represented in *Jubilees* as forming a continuous chain of priests, with each new priest being instructed by his predecessor in proper priestly procedure. (9)

To further illustrate the continuity between these pre-Sinai priests and their post-Sinai successors, the author of *Jubilees* detailed the form and content of the sacrifices that they offered, having these conform to prescriptions for sacrifices found later in the Pentateuch, principally in the book of Leviticus. For the same reason, the author depicted these pre-Sinai priests as celebrating (and properly observing the sacrificial laws of) various holy days—the Feast of Booths, the Feast of Weeks, the Day of Atonement—even though these holy days were first mentioned only later in the Torah, as part of or following the Sinai covenant. Indeed, the author was so bold as to assert that the very reason for the existence of these holy days was to be found not in divine commandments, but in human initiative, things arising naturally out of the events of the patriarchs' own lives. That is to say, God did not command Abraham to celebrate the Festival of Booths (סוכות); on the contrary, such-and-such a thing happened in Abraham's life, and as a result he inaugurated the celebration of this festival *on his own initiative* (*Jub.* 16:5-27). Only later did God tell Moses to promulgate a law in the Torah (*Lev* 23:33-35) commanding Israelites to celebrate the festival that Abraham had initiated, and to celebrate it on the precise date that Abraham had chosen for it.

Similarly, Noah planted a vine and picked its fruit in the fourth year, which he guarded until the fifth year (*Jub.* 7:1-3); it was only much later, and in apparent imitation of Noah's act, that the Torah ordained similar treatment for the fruit of all trees (see *Lev* 19:23-25). (10) The message that all these changes introduced into the author's retelling of Genesis was clear: Sinai really did not matter very much. Rather, it was Israel's ancestors who counted—especially Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—since God had established His earliest covenants with them and their descendants, that is, *with us*, the Jews of *Jubilees*' own day. We were God's people long before the Sinai covenant, we worshiped Him back then in the same way that we worship Him now, and we will remain His people forever.

Not everything, of course, was perfect in the eyes of *Jubilees*' author. As mentioned, he believed that Judea in his own day was

(9) J. Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 96 (1993): 1-64, esp. 17-21.

(10) M. Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumran Halakhah," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2:571-88.

plunged in fornication (זנות) and impurity (טומאה), the latter term referring not to the ritual impurity imparted by contact with dead bodies and the like, but impurity arising largely from sexual immorality and contact with “foreigners,” that is, non-Jews. In addition, he felt that Israel in his day was lax about a number of other commandments: he repeatedly stresses Israel’s failure to observe properly the sabbath and various holy days. (11) It was for such reasons, he implied, that Israel still lived under foreign domination and had not yet been restored to its former glory and power. But if Israel now could abandon its waywardness in these matters, God would surely return His people to their proper place of honor and their lives would be blessed beyond measure (*Jubilees* 23). This—along with some particulars about the proper way to observe certain laws and practices—was the great message that *Jubilees*’ author sought to impart.

The Interpolator

The book of *Jubilees* was apparently a highly regarded work in Second Temple times. It was used by the author of the *Aramaic Levi Document* and was later cited as an authoritative book by the author of the *Damascus Covenant* (CD XVI:3) as well as in 4Q228 (*Work with Citation of Jubilees*) lines 9-10 and quite likely in 4Q384 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah^b*) fragment 8. It was also the inspiration for a whole section of 4Q225 (*Pseudo-Jubilees^a*), as well as of the *Genesis Apocryphon*. (12) Indeed, fragments of some fifteen different copies of *Jubilees* were found at Qumran. It continued to be valued by Jews and Christians on into later times.

Early in the original book’s career, however, one element in its narrative had, I believe, disturbed some readers, and one such reader (probably on behalf of a larger community) set out to put the situation aright. The disturbing element has already been mentioned: the author’s systematic attribution of the origin of various festivals and other practices to initiatives undertaken by the patriarchs on their own. This attribution was intended, as we have seen, to serve a good cause: it was a way of asserting that Israel’s basic way of worshiping God—the

(11) On the importance of the sabbath and its proper observance, see *Jub.* 1:10, 14; 2:17-22; 23:19.

(12) J. Kugel, “Exegetical Notes on 4Q225,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 73-98, and idem, “Which Is Older, the Book of Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem* (July 6-8, 2008) (ed. A. Roitman et al.; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 257-94.

very sacrifices that they offered, along with the holy days that they kept and yet other practices—went back well before Sinai; in fact, the patriarchs themselves had spontaneously instituted these things to serve the God who had chosen them and their descendants as His special people.

There could be no doubt that this is what *Jubilees* was saying: time and again, it is some event in the lives of the patriarchs that triggers such-and-such a practice, which only later became part of the Torah's laws. This was true even of Israel's holiest day, the Day of Atonement. According to *Jubilees* its origin went back to the day that Joseph's brothers brought his bloody tunic to their father, falsely implying that Joseph had been eaten by a wild animal. Jacob's resultant shock and mourning on the tenth day of the seventh month, "from evening to evening," then became an annual day of mourning expressing regret for people's sins; later, this practice was made official in the Torah as the Day of Atonement (*Jub.* 34:10-19).

Some readers no doubt bridled at the very idea of attributing the origin of the Torah's festivals and other laws to human initiative. To do so was to turn the whole idea of *imitatio Dei* on its head. God's divine laws, *Jubilees* seemed to be claiming, were rather a matter of *imitatio hominis*: such-and-such a practice is enjoined by God in the Torah as a result of something entirely human in origin, in fact, in the case of the Day of Atonement, as a result of a shabby deception by Joseph's brothers. Surely, this could not be right! So it was that the *Jubilees* Interpolator set out to "correct" this aspect of the book that he (and quite possibly, his group) found unacceptable. Every time that the original author attributed some practice to the initiative of Israel's patriarchs or matriarchs, the Interpolator would insert a passage claiming that long before those ancestors ever walked the globe, in fact, from the very beginning of time, these same practices had been decreed in a set of laws recorded by God on high. Abraham, Jacob, and the others may have thought they were founding some new practice, the Interpolator would say, but in fact, that practice had been ordained by God since the time of the Creation.

In service of this claim, the Interpolator borrowed a concept that had been in existence for some time: the Heavenly Tablets. (13) As

(13) The Heavenly Tablets themselves have been the topic of numerous studies. See, inter alia, F. García Martínez, "Las Tablas Celestes en el Libro de los Jubileos," in *Palabra y Vida: Homenaje a José Alonso Díaz en su 70 cumpleaños* (ed. A. Vargas Machuca and G. Ruiz; Madrid: Ediciones Universidad de Comillas, 1984), 333-49 = "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of *Jubilees*," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, 243-60; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 69-97;

various scholars have observed, the idea that some sort of writing tablets exist in heaven has a distinguished history, going back to ancient Mesopotamian writings. (14) Although the Hebrew Bible does not explicitly use the phrase “the Heavenly Tablets,” the same idea of divine writings (presumably kept in heaven) was clearly evoked in various biblical passages. (15) Still closer to the world of *Jubilees* is *1 Enoch*, a book that preceded *Jubilees* by perhaps fifty or a hundred years and parts of which the original author of *Jubilees* seems to have known and even cited. (16) In *1 Enoch*, the Heavenly Tablets are tablets on which the good and bad deeds of humanity are recorded and on which other heavenly mysteries, including future events, are revealed. (17) These same themes—that the Heavenly Tablets contain

R. A. Kraft, “Scripture and Canon in Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Hebrew Bible, Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation* vol. 1.1 (ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 199-216, esp. 205-9; C. Werman, “The Torah and the Te’udah Written on the Tablets,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473-92; H. Najman, “Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology, and Interpretive Authority,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 313-33; idem, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Times* (JSJSupp 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 119-25; M. Kister, “Two Formulae in the Book of *Jubilees*,” *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 289-300.

(14) S. M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” *JANES* 5 (1973): 345-53; also R. Eppel, “Les tables de la loi et les tables célestes,” *RHPHR* 17 (1937): 401-12.

(15) Thus, Moses at one point says to God that if he is unwilling to forgive Israel’s sin, “erase me at once from the book that you have written” (Exod 32:32). Psalm 69:29 similarly speaks of a “book of life” from which the wicked will be erased “and will not be written along with the righteous.” Isaiah 4:3 (clearly a late addition to the book) says of a group of survivors: “Whoever is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem will be called holy, everyone who has been *written for life* in Jerusalem.” Malachi 3:16 similarly speaks of “a book of remembrance [that] was written before [i.e., by] Him of those who revered the Lord and thought on His name.”

(16) See, e.g., *Jub.* 4:17 and *1 En.* 12:3-4; *Jub.* 4:17 and *1 En.* 80:1; *Jub.* 5:6 and *1 En.* 10:12, 13:1-2, 21:6; *Jub.* 5:7 and *1 En.* 10:12; *Jub.* 7:21-24 and *1 En.* 7:1, 8:1-2, 10:11, 12:4.

(17) Thus *1 En.* 81:1, 2 speaks of “the book of all the deeds of mankind and of all the children of flesh that shall be upon the earth to the remotest generations.” *1 Enoch* 93:2 says that Enoch learned from the Heavenly Tablets about “the sons of righteousness and the eternally chosen ones, and about the plant of uprightness.” In *1 En.* 103:2-3, Enoch reports that he has “read the Heavenly Tablets” about the righteous, “that all goodness and joy and glory are prepared for them.” In *1 En.* 106:19, Enoch says that he knows “the mysteries of the holy ones; for He, the Lord, has showed me and informed me, and I have read [them] in the Heavenly Tablets.” In *1 En.* 107:1, Enoch says that he saw written on the Heavenly Tablets “that generation after generation will do wrong, until a generation of righteousness arises and wrongdoing is destroyed and sin is wiped out from the earth and every good omen comes upon it” (see also 108:3, 7). On all these see L. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* (CEJL; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2007), esp. 81-86.

a record of the righteous and the wicked, as well as of events yet to occur—appear in other texts from this same period. (18)

However, all these texts view the Heavenly Tablets principally as a record of righteous and wicked people and events, both past and future. The particular innovation of the Interpolator was to use this existing concept of the Heavenly Tablets in order to solve his own problem with the book of *Jubilees*. So he adapted the Heavenly Tablets to a new purpose, previously undreamed of: they would also be the repository of a great body of divine legislation, statutes that had been “written and engraved” from the beginning of time and which, therefore, must have preceded any actions by Noah, Abraham, or the other patriarchs who *seemed* to have originated various festivals and other practices. (19)

Not only did the Interpolator seek to counter the original author’s claim about the human origin of these laws and practices, but he also sought to solidify his case by proposing further connections between incidents recounted in *Jubilees* and the Heavenly Tablets. He thus suggested that the curse of Cain in Gen 4:11 reflected a law on the Heavenly Tablets, one that ultimately found its way into the Pentateuch and became Deut 27:24. As for the manner of Cain’s death (unreported in the Pentateuch but described in *Jub.* 4:31-32), this likewise reflected

(18) Thus, among the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4Q180 (*Ages of Creation A*) opens: “The interpretation concerning the ages which God made: an age to mark the end of [] and that which was created. Before He created them He determined [their] operations [...every] age to its end. And this is engraved on the [heavenly] tablets.” Similarly, 4Q177 (*Catena A*) says: “Now behold: everything is written on the tablets, which... and inform him of the number of [all generatio]ns, and gran[t him as an] inheritance... [to] him and his offspring [for]ever” (3:12). The fragmentary 4Q537 (*Testament of Jacob* [?] *ar*), apparently connected to *Jub.* 32:16-26, has an angel bid Jacob to read from tablets that foretell the future, perhaps including future punishment of the wicked (last line). The Heavenly Tablets likewise make their appearance in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: *T. Lev.* 5:4 (here the Heavenly Tablets contain a record of past events, Levi’s virtuous execution of Hamor, “as it is written in the Heavenly Tablets”—this is clearly a reflection of *Jub.* 30:19), *T. Asher* 2:9 and other post-*Jubilees* texts.

(19) Note that the Interpolator *also* spoke of the Heavenly Tablets in the traditional sense: for example, a record of Abraham’s righteousness and his future appellation “the friend of God” were recorded on the Heavenly Tablets (19:9); so was the punishment to be suffered by Lot’s descendants (17:9), the reward to be given to the righteous (23:32), the curse to befall the Philistines (24:33), Levi’s righteous acts in slaughtering the Shechemites and the reward prepared for his descendants (30:5, 19), and so forth. But all these instances clearly belong to the “old” notion of the Heavenly Tablets, the same presented in *1 Enoch* and the other texts mentioned above. But in truth, the Heavenly Tablets were important to him principally for their value in confuting the original author’s idea that later biblical laws were based on the actions of the patriarchs.

a law in the Heavenly Tablets that ultimately became part of the Torah, namely Lev 24:19-20; and when Laban gave Jacob his excuse for switching brides—"It is not customary in our country to give the younger daughter before the older one"—the Interpolator inserted a passage claiming that such a law actually appears in the Heavenly Tablets. In all such instances, the Interpolator asserted that even before the event took place in patriarchal times, the law being invoked had been "written and inscribed on the Heavenly Tablets."

How could two such contradictory outlooks manage to coexist in the same book? Part of the Interpolator's genius was not to seem to disagree with the original author, but merely to supplement his words with the refrain, "And so it is written and ordained in the Heavenly Tablets." Time and again, where the original author had attributed a law or practice to one of the patriarchs, the Interpolator inserted his own qualifier: this may look like human initiative, but that is an illusion. Abraham seemed to have initiated the Festival of Booths on his own, but later "We [angels] blessed him eternally and all the descendants who would follow him through all the history of the earth, because he had celebrated this festival at its [proper] time in accord with the law of the Heavenly Tablets" (16:28)—magically, it would seem, Abraham had just guessed the right period of time for a celebration and the right (somewhat quirky) form of celebrating, building booths and dwelling in them for seven days! Later, Jacob may seem to have instituted the festive "Eighth Day of Assembly" (called in the Bible *עצרת*, Lev 23:36, Num 29:35) because he was "held back" (*נעצר*) at Bethel, but actually, "This is the way it was revealed that it should be, and it is written on the Heavenly Tablets" (32:28). In other words, long before Abraham, long before Noah, and even before Adam, all of divine law had been written in heaven, on the Heavenly Tablets. (20)

(20) I suspect that some scholars will seek to argue that *Jubilees* is nonetheless the work of a single author, who wished at one and the same time to attribute certain practices to the *apparent* initiative of various biblical figures, all the while asserting that these practices were in fact consonant with things written long before in the Heavenly Tablets. But it seems impossible to imagine one and the same person desiring to assert these two opposites: if he wished to say that God's laws were eternal, then by all means have Abraham or Noah initiate them on earth *at God's instruction*, or at least assert that God had somehow manipulated events so as to have these patriarchs unconsciously act in accordance with the Heavenly Tablets. But that is clearly not what *Jubilees* says. On reflection, it cannot be that both claims came from the same pen. Apart from this overall argument, however, lie the numerous internal contradictions in *Jubilees* that also indicate the presence of two writers, the second of whom often misunderstood what the first was saying. See Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, esp. 59-82, and Kugel, *Walk through Jubilees*, 227-96.

Although they thus acted out of completely different, indeed, opposite motives, the original author and the Interpolator did agree on one thing: the revelation at Mount Sinai did not count for much. For the original author, it did not count for much because the covenant proposed there—"If you obey me faithfully and keep my covenant, then you will be my treasured possession" (Exod 19:5)—was merely a reiteration, in his opinion, of a relationship that had existed for centuries before, indeed, one that went back to the first sabbath in history, when God decided to create His own special people. Moreover, at least some of the laws that were promulgated at Sinai were copied from the spontaneous actions of Israel's illustrious ancestors. For the Interpolator, by contrast, the Sinai revelation did not count for much because its laws had *always* been in existence on the Heavenly Tablets. What happened at Sinai was thus merely a public proclamation of existing statutes.

I do not wish to rehearse here all the evidence of the Interpolator's existence and the insertions that he made into the existing book of *Jubilees* (I have dealt with these at length in my recent commentary, *A Walk through Jubilees*). Let me simply mention that those insertions are marked by three independent variables. The insertions are characterized, first of all, by what Liora Ravid has termed the "special language of the Heavenly Tablets." In effect, there are certain expressions—linguistic tics, one might say—that appear again and again in the Interpolator's insertions but nowhere outside of them. Thus, he likes to have the angel of the presence turn to Moses and say, "Now you, Moses, do such-and-such." He also consistently refers to this-or-that law with paired verbs—it is "written and inscribed," "established and written," and so forth. Moreover, the laws he refers to are to last "for eternal generations" and "have no temporal limits." One might try to argue that these linguistic tics appear only in these passages because they are the only ones that deal with laws—that is, that the "special language of the tablets" is not characteristic of any interpolator, but of the literary genre of legal writings.

But such a claim proves to be false. There are numerous laws in *Jubilees* that were mentioned by the original author, such as the law prohibiting human bloodshed (*Jub.* 5:7-8), the law of fourth-year produce (*Jub.* 7:1-3), the laws promulgated by Noah to his sons prohibiting public nudity, cursing with the divine name, fornication, impurity, and injustice, as well as laws commanding the honoring of parents, the love of one's neighbor, the covering of blood, and the consuming of blood (all these in *Jub.* 7:20-33). Most of these later became laws in the Torah, yet *Jubilees'* author never suggests that any of them was "written and established in the Heavenly Tablets," nor does he use any

of the idiosyncratic phrasing characteristic of the “language of the Heavenly Tablets” in connection with them. He does not do so because he never heard of the Heavenly Tablets invoked as a repository of divine law: that was the Interpolator’s idea.

By the same token, careful inspection will reveal that the Interpolator mentions other items as being written in the Heavenly Tablets, even though they are not strictly laws: the condemnation of Lot in *Jub.* 16:9; the prediction of a future golden age (*Jub.* 23:32); the designation of Levi’s descendants for the priesthood (*Jub.* 30:18-19); and Isaac’s blessing of his grandsons (*Jub.* 31:32)—all these things were likewise said to have been “established and inscribed” on the Heavenly Tablets and are consequently characterized by the “special language of the tablets,” even though they are not laws.

By contrast, some very similar passages written by the original author are never said to have been inscribed in heaven, nor are they otherwise characterized by the “language of the tablets.” For example, God’s prediction of Israel’s return to keeping His commandments in *Jub.* 1:23-25 is quite similar in content to the return to God’s laws described in *Jubilees* 23 and attributed by the Interpolator to the Heavenly Tablets—yet the former is not said to be written in the Heavenly Tablets and so has none of the special language associated with it. Noah’s curse of Canaan (*Jub.* 7:10) is altogether comparable to Isaac’s curse of the Philistines (*Jub.* 24:13), but only the latter is alleged to be written and engraved in the Heavenly Tablets. Perhaps most surprisingly, even the “tablets of the divisions of the years” (*Jub.* 1:29) from which the angel is ordered to dictate to Moses in chapter 1 are not identified as being the Heavenly Tablets, nor do they exhibit any of the characteristic phrasing associated with those tablets.

There can be only one explanation for all this: the original author of *Jubilees* knew nothing of this heavenly book of laws; that was the invention of the Interpolator. In the same vein, Enoch’s book of the signs of heaven (*Jub.* 4:17), his written warning to the children of men (*Jub.* 4:18) and his written judgment and condemnation of the “wickedness of mankind”—none of these is written in the Heavenly Tablets either. God’s famous declaration, “My spirit will not henceforth reside in humanity, for they are flesh” (*Jub.* 5:8) was never said to have been “written and inscribed” on high, because this part of *Jubilees* was written by the original author. So here is the first independent variable. The mention of the Heavenly Tablets, along with the linguistic ties that accompany them (“Now you, Moses, do such-and-such,” the paired verbs “written and inscribed” and the like, and laws that would last “for eternal generations” and “have no temporal limits.”), are one clear indication that the passage in question was authored by the Interpolator.

The second independent variable lies in the fact that the Interpolator's insertions frequently contradict or misunderstand the original author's ideas, and these contradictions offer further proof that the author of these passages could not have been the same person as the one who wrote the surrounding narrative. (21) Thus, throughout his book, the original author represented God as having an implacable enemy, the Satanic "Angel [of] Mastema." For this reason, the author wrote that as the Israelites were leaving Egypt in the exodus, Mastema "was bound and locked up" so he could not interfere with their escape (*Jub.* 48:15). But the Interpolator, apparently for theological reasons, did not like the idea of *any* power opposing God; he therefore went out of his way to assert that it was "all the forces of Mastema" who carried out the last of the Ten Plagues, "to kill every firstborn in the land of Egypt" and bring about the exodus (*Jub.* 49:2). An alert reader might rightly ask: Whose side was Mastema on?

In narrating the creation of Adam and Eve, the original author evoked the law in Lev 12:1-5 concerning a mother's impurity after childbirth (one week of impurity if the newborn was a male, but two weeks if the newborn was a female). He argued that this apparently irrational distinction reflected the fact that, when Adam and Eve were created at the end of the first week of creation, Eve had originally been (according to him) a little pouch inside Adam; she only emerged as a full human being at the end of the second week (*Jub.* 3:8). This was a fine way of resolving the apparent contradiction between Gen 1:27 ("male and female" created simultaneously) and 2:21-22 (Adam created long before Eve): the former verse referred to Eve-the-pouch, the latter to Eve-the-person. But the Interpolator misconstrued the author's purpose in evoking Lev 12:1-5; this led him to claim that its significance was that Adam and Eve, as God's "children," had themselves become impure in the process of being born (*Jub.* 3:9-14)—an inference that does not even fit the provisions of Lev 12:1-5, which speaks only of the mother's impurity.

Both the original author and the Interpolator condemned public nudity, but they disagreed on those to whom this prohibition applied: the Interpolator claimed it applied only to Jews, the original author held it applied to all of humanity. The Interpolator misconstrued the original author's account of the near-sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22) as a precedent for the Passover festival—which the original author never intended it to be: this "precedent" starts, by the original author's dating, on the twelfth of the month, while Passover always starts in the last hours before the fifteenth. Some of these inconsistencies (I listed

(21) Some of these were first pointed out by Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 59-82.

fourteen in all) are relatively minor, others not so minor, but considered as a group they constitute a problem for anyone who would wish to claim that this book had a single author. (22)

The third independent variable lies in the contrasting outlooks of the two writers concerning the Torah's laws. As we have seen, the original author sought to claim that many biblical laws and practices reflect things that were initiated spontaneously by various patriarchs; the Interpolator hated this idea, believing that biblical laws must be altogether of divine origin. Now, theoretically, the first two variables mentioned above might have had no connection to these two contrasting views of biblical law. That is, the special language of the tablets (variable #1) tells us nothing about the legal philosophy of the person using it; either the original author or the Interpolator could have said such things as "Now you, Moses, do such-and-such" (since both of them do introduce laws and other practices in the book). Likewise, either of the two writers could have said that something (a law or anything else) was "written and inscribed," "established and written," "for eternal generations," and so forth. In other words, these little linguistic tics tell us nothing about the *outlook* or ideology underlying the statement. So it is certainly striking that these linguistic tics are found only in passages that otherwise conform to the legal philosophy of the Interpolator. Similarly, the fact that many insertions seem to misunderstand or misrepresent the original author's point (variable #2) tells us nothing about the outlook or legal philosophy of the person responsible for the misunderstanding. Yet here too, those contradictions or misunderstandings are found only in passages that also illustrate the legal philosophy of the Interpolator. This three-way convergence of independent variables cannot be a coincidence.

Let me conclude by sketching in somewhat sharper terms the Interpolator's overall cast of thought. Its most salient feature has already been described. The Interpolator simply could not stand the idea that the actions of human beings had ever determined divine laws. That is why his legal insertions are all of the same character: "This may sound as if Abraham initiated something," he says, "but actually that thing already existed on the Heavenly Tablets." He does not say how Abraham or the others ended up duplicating things written long ago on high, whether it happened as a simple coincidence or an act of divine manipulation, but however it happened, it happened. Nowhere is the underlying ideology manifest in such claims quite so clear as in the Interpolator's treatment of the Festival of Weeks (*Šābû'ôṭ*). The same horror that he has with regard to any human role in creating

divine statutes carries over even to human intervention in determining the starting time of this festival. The Pentateuch clearly states that the date of *Šābū'ôt* is to be arrived at by human beings counting off seven weeks from the time of the 'omer offering. Hence its name, *Šābū'ôt*, "Weeks." But this whole idea was anathema to the Interpolator. *Human beings determining such a thing? Never!* And so, in one of his longest interpolations, he sets out to claim that the name of this festival does not refer to the seven "weeks" (*šābū'ôt*) counted by people each year, but to "oaths" (*šēbū'ôt*), specifically, the oaths sworn by Noah and his sons after the great flood. (There are no such oaths in the Pentateuch; the Interpolator made them up so as to be able to change the name of this festival from *Šābū'ôt* [Weeks] to *Šēbū'ôt* [Oaths].) Thus reconstituted, the "Festival of Oaths" had nothing to do with humans counting—in fact, the Interpolator goes out of his way to assert that this festival had been celebrated in heaven long before human beings began celebrating it. No human counting of weeks here!

For the same reason, the Interpolator solemnly warns against those who will someday study the phases of the moon in order to create a lunisolar calendar, one that requires human beings to catch sight of the new moon and thus establish the start of each month (in the process determining the date of any holy days occurring in each month), as well as to decide, on the sole basis of human judgment, whether or not to intercalate an extra month before the start of the spring New Year—both of these procedures were apparently endorsed by the Interpolator's halakhic opponents. In place of such a calendar, he espouses one quite similar to the one known to us from Qumran, in which each year has an official length of 364 days and in which each month has a predetermined number of days regardless of the phases of the moon. All this bespeaks the Interpolator's own, particular mentality and the reason for his various insertions into the book of *Jubilees*.

APPENDIX:

A REPLY TO JAMES VANDERKAM

Since James VanderKam has devoted a considerable part of his own contribution to an examination of some of the arguments presented in my recent book, *A Walk through Jubilees*, I should like, in the spirit of friendly dialogue, to discuss further a few matters that he brings up in his essay. For readers interested in a full presentation of my case, I am afraid that there is no substitute for actually reading my book's running commentary on *Jubilees* (chapter 1) as well as its extended examination of the two quite different notions of divine law embodied in the work of the original author and the Interpolator (chapter 2),

its discussion of fourteen thematic contradictions within *Jubilees* and not merely the two mentioned here by VanderKam (chapter 3); and, finally, its analysis of the very different pattern of divine names found in the writings of the original author and the Interpolator (chapter 4) as well the clear distinction in the two writers' understanding the word תְּעוּדָה (again, chapter 3). In the present context, however, I will refer only to the items mentioned in VanderKam's article. He begins:

At the outset it should be said, however, that his [Kugel's] central contention that in the material from the author spontaneous actions of a patriarch become the basis for a law in the Torah is highly dubious. *Jubilees* 1 and other passages leave the strong impression that events are determined beforehand, and in specific cases explicit heavenly guidance is what leads to a patriarchal action which is hardly, therefore, spontaneous (see, for instance, *Jub.* 16:10-19 as the context for Abraham's celebration of the first Festival of Tabernacles in vv. 20-31).

I am not sure on what VanderKam's "strong impression" of determinism in chapter 1 of *Jubilees* is based. It may derive from the author's initial description of the scope of his book, which VanderKam has translated as covering "the events of the years, of the weeks of their jubilees *throughout all the years of eternity*." (23) This last phrase does indeed sound as if everything is predetermined. But as I have pointed out elsewhere, the phrase in the original Hebrew surely was שְׁנוֹת עוֹלָם, which means not "years of eternity," but "bygone years," "days of yore" (see in this sense Deut 32:27, Isa 63:9, 11, Amos 9:11, Mic 5:1, 7:14; and Ps 77:6)—that is, it refers to the past rather than any predetermined future. (24) It is true, of course, that the *Jubilees*' author believes in a God who controls all that is to happen on earth and in heaven, and determinism in this sense—found not just in chapter 1 of *Jubilees*, but throughout the book—will always be at odds with the idea of human beings doing *anything* on their own; this is the classic conflict between divine omniscience and human free will (a conflict present in some sense in most forms of Judaism and Christianity). But the specific case that VanderKam mentions in chapter 16 of *Jubilees* hardly suggests that "heavenly guidance is what leads to a patriarchal action"—that is, that it was some sort of heavenly guidance that caused Abraham to build some booths (סֹכֹת) and thereby celebrate the Festival of Booths. Quite the contrary! *Jubilees* 16:10-19 narrates two divine visits to Abraham. In the first, God causes Sarah to become pregnant and give birth to Isaac. In the second (starting in *Jub.* 16:15), the angel of the presence and some other (unspecified) angels come and announce to Abraham that he will ultimately have a grandson who will become a "holy seed." Abraham and Sarah are "extremely happy" at this news; Abraham

(23) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1.

(24) See *A Walk through Jubilees*, 18; cf. also my "The Book of Jubilees: Is it a Commentary on Genesis or an Intended Replacement?" in *Congress Volume Munich 2003* (ed. C. M. Maier; VTSup 163; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

then builds an altar and “celebrated a joyful festival in this month—for seven days—near the altar... He constructed tents [i.e. booths, סוכות] for himself and his servants during this festival.” God did not instruct Abraham to celebrate for seven days or to build those booths—these are spontaneous actions that Abraham undertook on his own. So to say that “explicit heavenly guidance is what leads to a patriarchal action” here is simply wrong. And it is wrong in all the other instances I cited as well. In fact, it is precisely the absence of “explicit heavenly guidance” that bothered the Interpolator: “How can you claim,” he seems to ask of *Jubilees*’ original author, “that the various festival practices prescribed by the Torah were initiated by Abraham on his own?” This episode, along with the other cases I mention in my book, are precisely what moved the Interpolator to put pen to parchment in the first place: whenever the author implied that some festival or law or practice mentioned in the Torah (such as VanderKam’s other example, the Day of Atonement) came about as a result of something human beings did on their own, the Interpolator was quick to suggest the contrary: everything had been prescribed in advance on the Heavenly Tablets.

VanderKam further writes about my treatment of the festival of *šābū’ôt*: “At this point Kugel alters what the Ethiopic text (the only surviving version for the passage) calls the holiday—the ‘Festival of Weeks’—to ‘Festival of Oaths,’ though he does put Oaths in brackets. The text of *Jubilees* in fact never refers to a Festival of Oaths.”

Well of course it doesn’t! The Ethiopic text is a translation of a now-mostly-lost Greek translation of the now-mostly-lost Hebrew original. But there can be no doubt that the original text in Hebrew referred to the festival of שבועות. Now this word, as was pointed out long ago, (25) is ambiguous: these letters could be pronounced as “weeks” (*šābū’ôt*) or they could be “oaths” (*šēbū’ôt*). It was precisely that ambiguity that opened the door for the Interpolator’s bold move: “All along,” he seeks to say to readers, “you’ve been thinking that this festival is called the Festival of *šābū’ôt* because its occurrence is determined by humans counting off seven weeks, but actually, it is the Festival of *šēbū’ôt*, a commemoration of some oaths (unmentioned in the Bible) sworn by Noah and his sons.” This was the Interpolator’s way of refuting the obvious and saying that the Festival of שבועות had nothing to do with humans counting off seven weeks, an idea that he found most distasteful for reasons I have explained. So he created an imaginary incident whereby “Noah and his sons *swore an oath* not to consume any blood that was in any animate being. During this month he [Noah] made a covenant before the Lord God... For this reason it has been ordained and written on the Heavenly Tablets that they should celebrate the festival of שבועות during this month once a year to renew the covenant” (*Jub.* 6:10, 17). Now, what could the word שבועות mean in *Jub.* 6:17—the oaths mentioned in *Jub.* 6:10, or the seven “weeks” that are mentioned *nowhere* in *Jubilees*? In fact, the Interpolator was careful to say (twice, in fact) that these events took place

(25) S. Zeitlin, *The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1939), 6.

“during this month” precisely because the Festival of Oaths had, according to him, no precise date—so it couldn’t involve counting off seven weeks. (26) However, the reference to the “Festival of שבועות” was mistranslated into Greek as the “Festival of Weeks,” since that was the only biblical festival of שבועות that the translator knew of. This will also explain why VanderKam’s next point is also in error:

The writer [of *Jubilees*] objects to those who make the year ten days too short by basing their calculations on lunar phenomena, but he does not refer to those who, in obedience to Lev 23:15-16, count the seven weeks for determining the date of the Festival of Weeks. In *Jubilees*, because of its 364-day calendar, the date for that festival was fixed.

VanderKam claims here that there is no reference to counting off seven weeks in *Jubilees* because the festival in any case has a specific date, the fifteenth day of the third month. (One wonders, if so, why it should ever have been called the “Festival of Weeks” in *Jubilees*, as VanderKam claims the ambiguous “Festival of שבועות” is to be understood. If there was no counting of seven weeks, then why call it that?) But in fact what the Interpolator goes on to say is that this festival only acquired its specific date when the angel of the presence instructed Moses to combine the previously dateless Festival of Oaths with the quite separate Festival of First Fruits, which did have a date: “Now you command the Israelites to keep this festival during all their generations as a commandment for them: one day in the year, during this month, they are to celebrate the festival. Because it is the Festival of שבועות [i.e. Oaths] and the Festival of Firstfruits. This festival is twofold of two kinds” (*Jub.* 6:20-21). What could the angel of the presence have possibly meant except that, prior to his giving Moses this instruction, there were two separate festivals, only one of which had a fixed date? How could Moses combine two things that were already combined?

With regard to his other example, the Day of Atonement, VanderKam writes that *Jubilees*’ two treatments of that day, in *Jub.* 5:17-18 and *Jub.* 34:18-19, did not come from two separate hands; in fact, he dismisses the claim in a single paragraph, concluding: “There is no convincing evidence for an Interpolator in 5:13-18, which like 34:12-19 is from the author of the book.”

What nevertheless struck me as convincing evidence was the fact that the second passage, which was the original writer’s explanation of the origin of the Day of Atonement, tied it to the sad events in Jacob’s lifetime that occurred on that day, the tenth of the seventh month. “Jacob mourned all that night [after his son’s brought Joseph’s bloody tunic to him]” and all the next day. “For this reason it has been ordained regarding the Israelites that they should be distressed on the tenth of the seventh month... This day has been ordained so that they may be saddened on it for their sins, all their transgres-

(26) It is only much later, at Mount Sinai, that Moses is instructed to combine the Festival of Oaths with the Festival of First Fruits (which does have a date according to *Jubilees*, the fifteenth of the third month) so that people would not forget to observe it.

sions, and all their errors; so that they may purify themselves on this day once a year" (34:13, 18-19). Why, in chapter 34, should the author of *Jubilees* be telling us that the Day of Atonement came to be established as a result of Jacob's mourning for Joseph when a much earlier passage, *Jub.* 5:13-18, had announced that the Day of Atonement was established as an escape clause for Jews following the institution of strict and swift justice after the Flood: "Regarding the Israelites it has been written and ordained; 'If they turn to Him in the right way, he will forgive their all their wickedness and pardon all their sins. It has been written and ordained that he will have mercy on all who turn from all their errors once each year'" (*Jub.* 5:17-18). The obvious answer is that the original author, who wrote *Jub.* 34:13-19, never heard of the passage in *Jub.* 5:17-18 because the latter was written by a later hand, that of the Interpolator. That is why the original author makes no allusion to it—which he certainly ought to have if he authored both passages. This difference is also reflected in the two contrasting understandings of the Day of Atonement: the Interpolator's passage reflects what was an ongoing struggle with the apparent "blank check" issued by Lev 16:29-30 (it says nothing of the need to repent in order to gain forgiveness), a struggle reflected in Sir 34:25-26, Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1:188, and various rabbinic texts, but not in the original author's description of the day. (27) Apparently, he never heard of this issue.

From a certain angle, I must confess that *A Walk through Jubilees* must be considered something of a failure, in that one of this generation's leading scholars of *Jubilees* reports herein that he has examined my book's various arguments for the existence of the Interpolator, stretching out over some 300 pages, and pronounced himself "convinced by not a single one of them." My hope, however, is that others may nonetheless examine the same arguments and come to a different conclusion. As mentioned earlier, my case does not rest on the two contradictory passages that VanderKam treats here (which I hope I have successfully explained), nor even on all fourteen such cases that I dealt with in my book, but on the convergence in them of three independent characteristics: 1) the special vocabulary that distinguish the Interpolator's insertions from the rest of the book, 2) the fact that those insertions frequently contradict or misunderstand the original author's point, and 3) the Interpolator's position on divine law in his insertions, a position that is completely at odds with that of the original author (and which was probably the reason for his creating his interpolations). Any one of these three ought to be sufficient, I believe, to convince a reader of the Interpolator's existence; the convergence of all three should make that conclusion virtually inevitable.

James KUGEL

(27) See J. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 750-51.

SOME QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO A SUPPOSED INTERPOLATOR IN THE BOOK OF *JUBILEES* FOCUSED ON THE FESTIVAL OF WEEKS (*JUB.* 6:1-22)

Summary

This contribution brings forward some questions with regard to Kugel's hypothesis about a supposed interpolator who would have inserted several additions in a nearly finished text of the book of *Jubilees*. Without denying the fact that there are tensions within the text of the book, the question remains whether these all disappear when the passages of the supposed interpolator are removed. Kugel asserts that a deterministic worldview is characteristic of the supposed interpolator. However, the rest of the text also often shows this deterministic worldview. The unique relationship between God and Israel is incorporated in the order of the creation. Most important is the relativizing of the Sinaitic covenant. The first celebration of a certain festival does not point to the fact that they themselves invented these festivals out of the blue, but to the fact that Israel was already ordered to celebrate these festivals before the Sinaitic covenant. The patriarchs celebrated them on earth in accordance with what was written on the heavenly tablets, and in accordance with how they had already been celebrated in heaven from the time of the creation. In contrast to what Kugel asserts, the strong parallelism between *Jub.* 14 and *Jub.* 15 makes clear that Abraham celebrates not two different festivals but just one, the very same Festival of Weeks, in which he renews the covenant in the middle of the third month.

Introduction

RECENTLY, James Kugel put forward his view of the composition of the book of *Jubilees*. (1) His theory is clearly formulated and mostly put in straightforward terms. In his eyes, most

(1) He proposed his theory for the first time in 2009. See J. L. Kugel, "On the Interpolations in the Book of *Jubilees*," *RevQ* 24 (2009): 215-272. This article has

of the book of *Jubilees* is the work of a single author (“the original author”), not only its narrative sections but also many legal passages. However, someone else, whom he calls an “Interpolator” (consequently written with a capital “I”), later inserted a series of twenty-nine passages of his own, which are mostly small. They deal with biblical law and are related to the heavenly tablets. (2) Many of them contradict what the rest of the book says, and reflect a different ideology. The insertions sometimes complemented what the original author of *Jubilees* was saying, but sometimes they are reactions to what has just been said in the book of *Jubilees*. (3) The interpolations were inserted into what was already a finished text. According to Kugel, “After removing the supposed interpolations, the result is a smoothly running text with no apparent gaps or other infelicities.” (4) He conceives of the interpolator as an absolute determinist: “The whole future of Israel and the world had long before been decided and recorded on high.” (5) In patriarchal times, the precedents for the laws were not an expression of God’s eternal connection with Israel, as was the case for the original

been republished with some important modifications in idem, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 227-296 (= chapter 3: “The Contradictions in the Book of *Jubilees*”). Chapter 2 (“The Sources of the Book of *Jubilees*”) of this book explores the matter of multiple authorship in *Jubilees*, highlighting two sharply conflicting views of the origins of the Torah’s laws. It repeats and reformulates much of the material of the aforementioned publications. See idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 207-226. In his commentary on the book of *Jubilees*, whose purpose is “to walk the reader through the fifty chapters that make up the book of *Jubilees*,” many of these insights reoccur. Inevitably, there is much overlap between this commentary and the aforementioned articles. See idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 1-207 (= chapter 1: “A Walk through *Jubilees*: An Exegetical Commentary”), quotation on p. 16. Also see J. L. Kugel, “The Figure of Moses in *Jubilees*,” *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1 (2012): 77-92.

(2) Here is a list of the twenty-nine passages, which are, according to Kugel, later insertions: *Jub.* 2:24-33; 3:9-14; 3:29-32; 4:5-6; 4:31-32; 5:13-19; 6:10-14; 6:17-22; 6:23-38; 13:25-27; 14:20b; 15:25-34; 16:3; 16:9; 16:28-31; 18:18-19; 19:8-9; 23:32; 24:33; 28:6b-7; 30:8-17; 30:18-23; 31:31-32; 32:9c-15; 32:27-29; 33:10-20; 41:23-26; 49:2-17; 49:22-23. See Kugel, “On the Interpolations in the Book of *Jubilees*,” 261-265; cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 284-289. In his last publication on the subject, he raises the question of whether there might also be a third hand at work in *Jub.* 50:6-13 (Sabbath laws). Also one of the two versions about the fourth year produce (*Jub.* 7:1-6 or 7:35-39) points to a third hand. Finally, a second version about Jacob in Bethel, interwoven with another one (*Jub.* 32:21, 24-26) cannot be ascribed to the “Interpolator.” See Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 273-280. This idea of another interpolation was also interwoven in his commentary. See idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 74; 155-157; 204.

(3) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 219; idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 11-14; 207-226.

(4) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 266; idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 289.

(5) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 267.

author, but a demonstration that all Sinaitic laws and their application had been written long before in the heavenly tablets. According to Kugel, the interpolator was in polemical opposition to other groups with regard to the calendar, the Sabbath rules, circumcision on the correct day, and the second tithe. He, therefore, lived at the very beginning of the Qumran community's founding. (6)

For the formulation of his theory, Kugel especially refers to Liora Ravid and Michael Segal. (7) Ravid makes a distinction between the literary style of the narratives and the drier style found in the sections that deal with the laws on the heavenly tablets. (8) According to Segal, this unique, uniform terminology of the heavenly tablets is not merely a literary device but also an indication of the coming into being of the book of *Jubilees*. (9) And this is because, according to him, *Jubilees* is not a uniform and homogeneous work, composed by a single author. He points to internal contradictions, doublets, tensions, and discrepancies. There are contradictions particularly between the legal passages and the rewritten stories on which these laws are supposedly based. These contradictions are the result of the literary development of

(6) Kugel, "On the Interpolations," 269; idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 293-294.

(7) Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 12; 227-230. To a lesser extent he also refers to Devorah Dimant and Menahem Kister. See D. Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch in the Books of Enoch," *VT* 33 (1983): 14-29; M. Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:571-588. However, several authors have tried to point to editorial adaptations. Cf. J. C. VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of *Jubilees*," *CurBS* 6 (2008): 405-431 (esp. 410-411); M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 11-21. J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (JSJSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 12-14. Some consider the eschatological passages to be additions (cf. M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* [Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1960], 39-42; G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* [StPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971]; more recently: C. Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen, und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006], 234-324; 509-512). Others point to problems in the chronological framework (E. Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of *Jubilees*," *RevQ* 3 [1961]: 3-40) or to inconsistencies between the narratives and the halakhic additions (Cf. L. Ravid, "The Relationship of the Sabbath Laws in *Jubilees* 50:6-13 to the Rest of the Book," *Tarbiz* 68 [2000]: 161-166 [Hebrew]).

(8) L. Ravid, "The Special Terminology of the Heavenly Tablets in the Book of *Jubilees*," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 463-471 [Hebrew]; Cf. Kugel, "On the Interpolations," 216-217; 220, et passim; cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 11-12, 227-228, et passim.

(9) M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden, 2007), 31; 77-78; 140-141; 228 n. 64.

Jubilees. An editor has adapted an already existing rewritten account of the biblical stories; he has enriched them with halakhic material and enclosed them in a chronological framework. The edited layer is consistent in style, use of language, and theological viewpoint, whereas the adapted stories are not consistent in any of these respects. (10)

The clarity of Kugel's hypothesis and the regular repetition of the same arguments make it tempting to accept his theory. Very recently, the theory has become a little more complicated, since Kugel has now suggested a third hand at work in the book of *Jubilees*. (11) In this contribution, I would like to bring forward some questions with regard to this theory. I will focus on Kugel's argumentation for the existence of interpolations, especially in *Jub.* 6:1-22. These verses deal with the Festival of Weeks, which was understood by the interpolator, according to Kugel, as the Festival of Oaths. (12)

The Interpolator's Signature

According to Kugel, there are obvious arguments for isolating *Jub.* 6:10-14, 17-22. These passages are to be considered as later additions. An important argument is the use of phrases that form the usual signature of the interpolator: "a law valid 'forever through all the history of the earth,' 'Now you [Moses] command the Israelites,' 'This law has no temporal limits because it is forever,' and so forth." (13) This is the terminology of the heavenly tablets. According to Kugel, *Jub.* 6:1-9, 15-16 are the words of the original author of the book.

My opinion is that, in a literary work, different genres with distinct sets of terminology can be used by a single author. The use of different genres in the book of *Jubilees* in and of itself does not point to a different author. According to VanderKam, it is not surprising that, with regard to a specialized subject such as the heavenly tablets, a limited set of terms can be used. (14) It goes too far to create, out of this limited use of texts and words, a separate author. Even a tension between a

(10) Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 21-34.

(11) See note 2.

(12) Kugel, "On the Interpolations," 243-250. The heading of this section that deals with the Festival of Weeks is "The Festival of Weeks and First Fruits." In the reworked version of this article, the heading is "The Festival of Weeks—or Was that 'Oaths'?" See idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 248-256 (at 248). The issue of the Festival of Weeks is also dealt with in his commentary: idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 58-66.

(13) Kugel, "On the Interpolations," 245. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 250.

(14) VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship," 415.

narrative and a halakhic text does not necessarily arise from a contradiction between an original author and an interpolator. It can also come from the point of view that one can find in an earlier authoritative text, for example Genesis, one to which the rewriter is, to a considerable extent, bound. (15)

In those cases where the heavenly tablets are omitted (see *Jub.* 2:24-33; 6:10-14; 13:25-27; 14:20b; 41:23-26; 49:22-23), according to Kugel, reference is simply made to things that have been written and ordained, or suchlike. (16) However, in some of these interpolations, a search for phrases like “written and ordained” will be in vain (*Jub.* 2:24-33; 14:20b; 41:23-26; 49:22-23). Although, in *Jub.* 32:21-22, one can find, “that was written in them” and “that was written on the tablets,” this is not evidence enough to be recognized as part of the signature of the interpolator. Even the occurrence of the phrase “throughout all ages” does not count as an example of the hand of the interpolator. Instead, he suggests a third hand at work. (17)

In some passages by the supposed interpolator one cannot find terminology that refers to a law or practice “without temporal limits,” which is according to Kugel characteristic for the interpolator. (18) I refer here to *Jub.* 4:5-6; 4:31-32; 5:13-19 (?); 16:3-4; 16:9 (?); 19:8-9; 24:33 (?); 28:6b-7; 32:27b-29; 41:23-26; 49:22-23. (19) Yet outside of those passages by the supposed interpolator, the terminology of laws “without temporal limits” can be found (e.g., *Jub.* 2:20; 5:12; 15:7, 9, 11, 13, 19).

Do those passages mentioning that Moses is ordered to command the Israelites really belong to a different layer of the text? My impression is instead that these admonitions belong to the rhetorical structure of the text as a whole. I would therefore not isolate *Jub.* 6:10-14, 17-22 from its literary context. The chapter shows a very tight structure. *Jubilees* 6 parallels the story of Gen 8:20-9:17, and it is tripartite in structure: I. *Jub.* 6:1-14 deals with the making of the covenant (v. 4, 10, 11). The most important condition for it is the prohibition concerning the consumption of blood (v. 7, 12, 13). Blood is destined for other purposes: to atone (v. 2), to sprinkle on the people in accordance with the words of the covenant (v. 11), and to make supplications in front of the altar (v. 14). II. *Jub.* 6:15-22 deals with the sign of the

(15) As VanderKam, “Recent Scholarship,” 414, has made plausible.

(16) So Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 11.

(17) Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 11.

(18) See note 13.

(19) Some of these texts mention the “day of judgment” (*Jub.* 5:13-19; 16:9; 24:33), but that is different from a law or practice “without temporal limits.”

covenant. Immediately after the flood, the sign was the rainbow in the clouds (v. 15-17). Later, the Festival of Weeks became the sign (v. 17-18). After the death of Noah, this festival was corrupted (v. 18-19), and it is therefore renewed and commanded for later generations (v. 20-22). III. *Jub* 6:23-38 deals with the correct calendar of 364 days or 52 weeks, divided into four periods of 13 weeks, each of which begins with a memorial festival. Noah ordained them as memorials for important events that had occurred during the Flood (v. 23-27). They were written down on the heavenly tablets (v. 28-31) and presented to the children of Israel (v. 32), although the latter will end up forgetting these days and keep the wrong calendar (v. 32-37).

Each section is structured in the same way. It consists of two parts, the first of which is linked to the text of Genesis and deals with an event in the life of Noah in connection with the flood (cf. v. 1-10; v. 15-16; v. 23-27). The second part deals with the significance of the story of Noah for later generations and contains two subdivisions, the first of which is introduced by “for this reason” (v. 11; v. 17; v. 28) and deals with the significance of the story either for Moses (v. 11-12) or for later generations, as written on the heavenly tablets (v. 17-19; v. 28-31). The second subdivision is introduced by “now you command the Israelites” (v. 13-14; v. 20-22; v. 32-37).

By ordering his material in this way, the author achieves the purpose of presenting Moses’ covenant and the accompanying prescriptions as a recurrence and imitation of the covenant and prescriptions of Noah, which was already ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. Moses renews what Noah has done before. At the same time, elements of the covenant and law of Moses found in the Pentateuch are antedated and put back into the time of Noah (e.g., the Festival of Weeks). Other elements cannot be found in the Pentateuch, but are nevertheless presented as laws of Moses, which are an imitation of the law of Noah (e.g., the solar calendar). Moses commands the law as valid for later generations, because it is engraved in the heavenly tablets.

A Festival of Weeks or a Festival of Oaths?

With regard to *Jub.* 6:10, Kugel argues that the “oath sworn by Noah and his sons not to eat blood is the Interpolator’s invention—there is no such oath in Genesis.” (20) The fact that there is an addition in the book of *Jubilees* with regard to the book of Genesis is in

(20) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 245. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 250. See also *ibid.*, 60.

itself not an argument for an intervention by another author. The book of *Jubilees* as a whole is a rewriting of the book of Genesis, and apart from omissions and variations, there are also several additions to note. Kugel continues that the purpose of this oath in *Jub.* 6:10 “was to lay the foundation for a verbal tie between the word for ‘oaths’ (*šebu’ot*) and the holiday that the Interpolator wished to associate with it, the Festival of Weeks (*šabu’ot*), otherwise known as the Festival of First Fruits.” (21)

It seems evident that the correlation between the making of the covenant in connection with the acceptance by means of an oath is due to paronomasia; in the original unvocalized Hebrew text, the consonants שבעות can be read either as *sabu’ot* (“weeks”) or as *sebu’ot* (“oaths”). The double nature of the festival (cf. *Jub.* 6:21) means that it could be referred to as a festival of first fruits and of making oaths. (22) This does not mean, however, that *Jub.* 6:10-14 refers to a Festival of Oaths to be separated from the Festival of Weeks. In *Jub.* 6, the celebration of the Festival of Weeks is connected with the remembrance of Noah’s covenant, which has two aspects: on the one hand, divine commitment, with the rainbow in the clouds as a sign that there would never be another flood on earth; and, on the other hand, human commitment, expressed in the oath not to consume blood. The Festival of Weeks, instead of the rainbow, becomes the visible sign of the covenant.

The human acceptance of the covenant is important in the book of *Jubilees*. (23) This commitment takes place by swearing an oath. Not only did Noah and his sons swear an oath not to consume any blood (*Jub.* 6:10), but Moses also made a covenant accompanied by an oath (*Jub.* 6:11). On the fifteenth of the third month Jacob made an oath to Laban, and Laban to Jacob (*Jub.* 29:7). At the same time, the book of *Jubilees* puts great emphasis on the well of the “oath.” In *Jub.* 22:1, this also occurs in connection with the celebration of the Festival of Weeks by Isaac and Ishmael.

In this way, the swearing of an oath not to consume blood is, in a homiletical way, connected to the Festival of Weeks. And also in

(21) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 245.

(22) O. S. Wintermute, “*Jubilees*: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 2:67, note f. According to Zeitlin the connotation of *sabu’ot* in *Jubilees* is not “weeks” but “oaths”; S. Zeitlin, *The Book of Jubilees. Its Character and Its Significance* (Philadelphia 1939), 6; VanderKam, “Weeks,” 896, defends the view that the word has a double meaning.

(23) Cf. A. Jaubert, *La Notion d’alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l’ère chrétienne* (Patristica Sorboniensia 6; Paris: Le Seuil, 1963), 107-111.

this way there is perfect integration with Gen 9:1-7 (= *Jub.* 6:5-9) in its broader literary context (Gen 8:20-9:11; *Jub.* 6:1-10). Moreover, one can point to obvious similarities between *Jub.* 6:10-14 and *Jub.* 6:1-9. The latter text is ascribed by Kugel to the original author. The swearing of an oath points to a human acceptance of the covenant (which is different in Gen 8:20-9:11). Moreover, the blood on the altar (compare Exod 24:8) is only possible if one gives up eating blood. In *Jub.* 6:1-9, the rewriting of Gen 8:20-22, one of the first things that Noah does when he goes forth from the ark is pour blood. Moreover, one can point to an integration of the making of the covenant with the sacrifice of Noah. In this way, there is no longer a one-sidedness to the covenant but a two-sidedness. The small changes in the text of *Jub.* 6:1-9 (with regard to Gen 8:20-22), which belongs, according to Kugel, to the original author, show a change from a one-sidedness of the covenant (Genesis) into a two-sidedness. The human acceptance of the covenant is shown by the offering of Noah. Therefore, *Jub.* 6:1-9 and *Jub.* 6:10-14 are well connected to each other, as we have also shown in the previous section.

Human Interference

According to Kugel, the overall purpose of the additions in *Jub.* 6 “was to combat something in the Torah that the Interpolator found highly disturbing: the idea that the date of the Festival of Weeks (*Šabu‘ot*) was to be determined each year by human beings counting off a series of seven weeks (Lev 23:15-21, Deut 16:9-11),” (24) and “to the Interpolator, the whole idea of human beings having some role in determining the date of one of God’s holy days must have seemed horrible...” (25) Therefore, in *Jub.* 6 Noah celebrates the Festival of Oaths, and not the Festival of Weeks.

The deterministic worldview is, for Kugel, one of the main characteristics for the ideology of the interpolator. (26) According to him, the mission of the interpolator was “to assert that the laws and practices that the original author seemed to attribute to humans were actually divine in origin and execution. The human role was illusory.” (27) The interpolator found it “profoundly troubling” that the original author’s implication was that the laws promulgated at Sinai had originated in the spontaneous actions of the patriarchs, for example, that Abraham had

(24) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 244. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 250.

(25) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 247. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 252-253.

(26) See especially Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 12-14; 208-213.

(27) Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 213.

originated the Festival of Tabernacles. (28) Therefore the interpolator used the heavenly tablets as a repository for a great set of divine laws, statutes that had been “written and engraved” from the beginning of time and which therefore must have preceded any actions by the patriarchs, who only seemed to have originated various festivals and other practices. (29)

I wonder whether this deterministic worldview of the supposed interpolator really is distinguishable from that of the supposed original author. One can point, for example, to *Jub.* 2:17-23, which according to Kugel belongs to the original author. This text shows that the setting apart of Israel from other nations is a component of the creation events. In another study, Kugel argues that God’s choice of Jacob as his first-born son should be understood as an intention, a plan, which God made known already at the beginning of his creation. Israel was chosen long ago during the first Sabbath in history: “I have written him down as my first-born son.” (30) One can go one step further: God made an absolute separation between Israel and the other nations at the beginning of creation, which corresponds to an absolute separation between good and evil. This dualism is inherent in the creation. From the first Sabbath onwards, Israel is *predestined* to be God’s chosen nation. (31) For this reason, the commandments are already given before the giving of the law at Sinai, and the forefathers are obliged to keep them. As a result, the supposed original author seems to adhere to an absolute determinism as well. Finally, Kugel regards the heavenly tablets as an expression of the determinism of the interpolator. However, the book of *Jubilees* itself is Moses’ transcription of the revelation of heavenly tablets at Sinai (cf. the prologue). (32) Moreover, the concept of the heavenly tablets occurs prior to *Jubilees* (Mesopotamian literature, Bible, and early Jewish literature), (33) and the sense of the term seems to be more varied than Kugel suggests. (34) Sometimes,

(28) Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 12.

(29) Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 216.

(30) Kugel, “4Q369 ‘Prayer of Enosh’ and Ancient Biblical Interpretation,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 119-148 (esp. 125-126).

(31) Compare Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 258-259.

(32) H. Najman, “Interpretation As Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379-410 (at 388), repr. in: idem, *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* (JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 39-71.

(33) S. M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” *JANES* 5 (1973): 345-352.

(34) F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243-260.

the heavenly tablets may indeed reflect a deterministic worldview, according to which all actions are recorded before they occur. However, in these cases they do not disclose very much about the author or editor of the book, but instead suggest his literary dependency on earlier works, especially *I Enoch*. (35) Elsewhere, the heavenly tablets are connected with the commandments and the covenant and are innovations of *Jubilees*. They correspond to the worldview that Israel was chosen during the first week of creation as the elected nation and God's first-born son. This required the giving of the commandments as stipulations of that covenant. However, before the giving of the law at Sinai, there was no Book of the Covenant. In these early times, the heavenly tablets functioned as the parallel of the earthly tablets and could attest to the special relationship between God and Israel. (36)

Furthermore, even if the supposed interpolations are removed, there remain passages from the supposed original author that seek to connect the laws to some human source but which are not corrected or contradicted by the interpolator (cf. *Jub.* 7:20, 26-33; 36:3-8). If these passages were so disturbing for the interpolator, why did he not correct these passages too? (37)

In addition to this, I would like to point to the Festival of Tabernacles, which is brought forward by Kugel as an example of the interference of the interpolator, who reacts, in his view, against the ideology of the original author who attributes the inauguration of the festival to a spontaneous action on the part of Abraham. (38) The text in which this festival is described (*Jub.* 16:20-31) is structured in two parts. In the first part (v. 20-27), several activities of Abraham are referred to: he built an altar (v. 20), celebrated a joyful festival for seven days (v. 20, 25), constructed tents (v. 21), made offerings that he burned on the altar (v. 22-23), and burned fragrant substances (v. 24). He rejoiced and blessed God (v. 25-27) and finally named the festival (v. 27), which he was the first to celebrate (v. 21). In the second part (v. 28-31), the angels blessed Abraham, because he had celebrated the festival properly *in accordance with the heavenly tablets* (v. 28). For this reason, it was also ordained for Israel (v. 29-30). With regard to the celebration of Israel, it is repeated that they should celebrate the

(35) Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 313-316.

(36) *Ibid.*

(37) See Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 210-213. After mentioning these passages, Kugel writes on p. 212: "Needless to say, none of this was particularly pleasing to the Interpolator's sensibilities. That is why he set about systematically undoing this central claim of the original author."

(38) Kugel, "On the Interpolations," 238-243; *idem*, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 12; 102-105; 242-248.

festival joyfully for seven days during the seventh month (v. 29) and that they should live in tents (v. 30). However, it is also said that they should “place wreaths on their heads and take leafy branches and willow branches from the stream” (v. 30). This was not mentioned in *Jub.* 16:20-27, and therefore it is said in *Jub.* 16:31 that Abraham did the same.

According to Kugel, these two parts are the work of two different hands. The first part is from the original author, whereas the second is from the interpolator. (39) In response to the joyful news of Isaac’s birth and Israel’s election, the original author describes how Abraham celebrated what was to become the Feast of Tabernacles, which is connected with joy. The interpolator not only repeats what the original author already had said, but he also inserts a description of what Abraham did (v. 31). It is true that what is said in *Jub.* 16:31 is somewhat out of place, because Abraham’s activities are described in *Jub.* 16:20-27. However, can this be considered a decisive factor for the supposition that *Jub.* 16:28-31 was written by a later interpolator? In my opinion, the purpose of this passage is to confirm that the festival that Abraham had celebrated, in accordance with the heavenly tablets, was ordained for Israel in later generations as well. In describing the festival to be celebrated by later generations, elements from the biblical description of the festival are taken up, which are then connected with Abraham.

Two Separate Festivals for Abraham?

The Festival of Weeks is an agricultural festival, celebrating the beginning of the wheat harvest. According to Kugel, the author of the book of *Jubilees* even established a precedent for this festival in his narration of the life of Abraham (*Jub.* 15:1-2). (40) This agricultural festival of the first fruits has no connection at all with the covenant of Noah (or any other covenant). Because of this, Kugel postulates two festivals, one in the time of Noah (Festival of Oaths) and one in the time of Abraham (Festival of the First Fruits). The precedent for the Festival of the First Fruits is created by the original author, whereas the festival in connection with the covenant of Noah would have been the invention of a later interpolator.

It is difficult to agree with this presupposition. Not only is the Festival of Weeks identified with the Festival of the First Fruits in

(39) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 236-241.

(40) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 248. Cf. *idem*, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 253-254.

the Bible (cf. Exod 34:22; Num 28:26), but also in the book of *Jubilees*: *Jub.* 6:21 (“Because it is the festival of weeks and it is the festival of the first fruits. This festival is twofold and of two kinds.”) and *Jub.* 22:1 (“Isaac and Ishmael came from the well of the oath to their father Abraham to celebrate the festival of weeks; this is the festival of the first fruits of the harvest.”). (41) Furthermore, *Jub.* 15:1-2 immediately precedes the covenant between God and Abraham (*Jub.* 15:3-22). The specifications of the festival are very similar to the covenant of Noah. It is kept in the same month and on the same festive occasion. There is also an offering made that leads to the concluding of the covenant. The content of the covenant itself as found in *Jub.* 15:3-21 does not deviate greatly from what appears in Gen 17. (42) The promises that are connected to the covenant are formulated in the same way: 1. fruitfulness (v. 4, 8; cf. v. 16, 19), that is Abraham as the father of many nations and kings (v. 6, 8; cf. v. 16); 2. God as the only God for Abraham and his descendants (v. 9, 10); and 3. the gift of the land (v. 10). The response to the covenant, circumcision (v. 11-14), is also adopted. (43)

In Gen 17, God takes the initiative in establishing the covenant, whereas in *Jubilees* Abraham acts on his own initiative, like Noah. Here, he is portrayed as a person who fulfills the stipulation of the renewed commandment that he has inherited from Noah. He celebrates the festival of the renewing of God’s covenant on the date specified and thereby undertakes that which Noah’s descendants neglected. An important element of Abraham’s initiative is the bringing of offerings. The Festival of Weeks, which is the festival of the renewing of the covenant, has the character of a harvest festival at which offerings are brought. In *Jub.* 14, the ambiguous procedure of Genesis 15 is made abundantly clear in an offering. In *Jub.* 15:1-2, the bringing of the offering is added to the text of Genesis, and Abraham’s sacrifice during this festival is described as “a bull, a ram, and a sheep,” which is not completely in agreement with the biblical prescriptions (Lev 23:15-22; Num 28:26-31; Deut 16:10).

(41) See also *Jub.* 16:13 (“Isaac was born on the feast of the first-fruits of the harvest.”). In the next verse, it is mentioned that the circumcision is executed “according to the *covenant* which was ordained forever” (*Jub.* 16:14). With regard to *Jub.* 22:1, Kugel speaks about a mistake on the part of the interpolator. See Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 256 (“one small but telling error”).

(42) See W. K. Gilders, “The Concept of Covenant in *Jubilees*,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 178-192.

(43) A deviation in *Jub.* 15 is the addition at the end (*Jub.* 15:25-34), which contains an interpretation of the narrative, especially with regard to the nature of circumcision and the relationship between God and the descendants of Abraham.

In conclusion, one can say that in *Jub.* 15 the concept of the making of the covenant between God and Abraham is changed into a renewing of the covenant. It is in fact a renewing of the covenant that God had made with Noah, a topic already introduced in the preceding chapter (*Jub.* 14:20). I cannot agree with Kugel, according to whom even Abraham had kept the two festivals separately, with two separate dates: “the Interpolator was careful to insert a brief mention that, in addition to inaugurating First Fruits, Abraham had also ‘renewed the festival [of Oaths] and the ordinance for himself forever’ (*Jub.* 14:20b).” (44) According to Kugel, *Jub.* 14:20b is an addition from a later interpolator, which makes clear that the Festival of the First Fruits that Abraham inaugurates in *Jub.* 15:1-2 is different from the festival mentioned in *Jub.* 14:20b (“the festival”). (45) It is difficult to understand why exactly the words of *Jub.* 14:20b would reflect the words of an interpolator and not also the words of *Jub.* 14:20a, which assert that the covenant with Abraham is a renewing of the covenant with Noah. Moreover, it is inaccurate to maintain that *Jub.* 15:1-2 is the inauguration of an agricultural festival (“Festival of the First Fruits”), which would have nothing to do with a commemoration of the covenant. On the contrary, the making of the covenant with Abraham is, from the beginning, characterized as a renewing of the covenant that God concluded with Noah. The specifications of the festival in *Jub.* 15:1-2 are very much similar to the covenant of Noah. It is celebrated on the same date of the year and at the same festival. There is also an offering that precedes the concluding of the covenant. It seems, therefore, unnecessary to consider the words of *Jub.* 14:20b as words of a later interpolator, which would point to a festival that was not the Festival of the First Fruits.

Date of the Festival

Kugel also writes that, “if the original author had wished in any way to associate Noah’s covenant with First Fruits, he could have effortlessly postponed Noah’s sacrifice to the fifteenth of the month.” (46) Furthermore, the fact that Noah’s offering had nothing to do with First Fruits makes it likely, according to Kugel, that Noah’s covenant has nothing to do with the Festival of Weeks. (47)

(44) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 249. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 254.

(45) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 215-72 (esp. 246-47, 263).

(46) Kugel, “On the Interpolations,” 249. Cf. idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 254.

(47) Ibid.

The Festival of the First Fruits occurs in several places in the book of *Jubilees*: *Jub.* 6:21; 15:1; 16:13; 22:1; 44:4. In two places, it is mentioned together with the Festival of Weeks: *Jub.* 6:21; 22:1. In *Jub.* 6:17 the Festival of Weeks is mentioned without mentioning the Festival of the First Fruits. Only if one ignores *Jub.* 6:21 does Noah's covenant have nothing to with the Festival of the First Fruits.

With regard to the date of the Festival of the First Fruits, in *Jub.* 6, it is merely "in the third month" (*Jub.* 6:20-21; cf. *Jub.* 6:1, 11, 17). Later the date becomes clear as it is placed in the middle of this month (*Jub.* 15:1; 16:13). In *Jub.* 44:1-5, Jacob made an offering on the seventh day of the third month (*Jub.* 44:1). After this, he remained there for seven days (*Jub.* 44:3), and then he celebrated the harvest festival—the first fruits of the grain (*Jub.* 44:4). Finally, the Lord appeared to him on the sixteenth of this month (*Jub.* 44:5). Therefore, a date on the fifteenth of the third month is implied. If this is true, "the morrow after the Sabbath" should have been on the twenty-sixth of the first month, assuming a calendar of 364 days (cf. *Jub.* 6:28-37), which is the first Sunday after the Festival of Unleavened Bread.

The Festival of the First Fruits is mentioned in relation to the concluding of the covenant. *Jubilees* 15:1-2 immediately precedes the covenant between God and Abraham (*Jub.* 15:3-22; cf. especially v. 9, 13, 19). In *Jub.* 22, Isaac and Ishmael came from the Well of the Oath to celebrate the Festival of the First Fruits. On this occasion, Abraham blesses his grandson Jacob, and asks him to renew the covenant (*Jub.* 22:15, 30). In *Jub.* 14, offerings are brought in the middle of the month, during which the covenant with Abraham is concluded, "like the covenant which we concluded during this month with Noah" (*Jub.* 14:20). In *Jub.* 44:1-5, offerings are also brought. (48)

Concluding Remarks

In this contribution I have posed some questions with regard to Kugel's hypothesis about a supposed interpolator who would have inserted several additions into a nearly finished text of the book of *Jubilees*. Without denying the fact that there are tensions within the text of the book of *Jubilees*, the question remains whether all of these tensions disappear when the passages of the supposed interpolator are removed. Passages from the supposed original author that seek to connect laws to some human source, and which are not corrected or

(48) Other important events that are related to the Festival of the First Fruits, to the festival in the middle of the first month include Isaac's birth (*Jub.* 16:13), Judah's birth (*Jub.* 28:15), and a pact between Jacob and Laban (*Jub.* 29:7).

contradicted by the interpolator, remain (e.g., *Jub.* 7:20, 26-33; 36:3-8). Moreover, while Kugel asserts that a deterministic worldview is characteristic of the supposed interpolator, I would say that the rest of the text also often shows this deterministic worldview. The unique relationship between God and Israel is incorporated in the order of the creation. Most important is the relativizing of the Sinaitic covenant. The first celebration of a certain festival does not point to the fact that these festivals were invented by the patriarchs out of the blue, but to the fact that Israel was already ordered to celebrate these festivals before the Sinaitic covenant. The patriarchs celebrated them on earth in accordance with what was written on the heavenly tablets, and in accordance with how they had already been celebrated in heaven from the time of the creation. In contrast to what Kugel asserts, the strong parallelism between *Jub.* 14 and *Jub.* 15 makes clear that Abraham celebrates not two different festivals but just one, the very same Festival of Weeks, through which he renews the covenant in the middle of the third month.

Jacques T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN

THE DYNAMICS OF COMPOSITION AND REWRITING IN JUBILEES AND PSEUDO-JUBILEES

Summary

The compositional process of the book of *Jubilees* has recently become the subject of intense debate among scholars of Second Temple Judaism in general, and the Dead Sea scrolls in particular. Scholarship on *Jubilees* has generally followed a synoptic approach, comparing the text of *Jubilees* to the extant versions of the Pentateuch deemed closest to it. As I have already suggested in previous studies, the literary development of *Jubilees* is in fact much more complex. While in my previous studies, I referred to the book in its current form as the product of “redaction”, here, I suggest that it is more appropriate to use the term “composition”. This study investigates and explores the implications of this proposed literary model, based upon an examination of three Qumran scrolls known as *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225-4Q227), and their relationship to *Jubilees*. The analysis below suggests, in contrast to the generally posited direction of development, that 4Q227 is in fact a source adopted by *Jubilees* as part of its compositional process. The latter, in its current complex literary form, was then itself subject to further rewriting in 4Q225-4Q226. These examples lead to a discussion of the implications of dynamic process of rewriting and composition for both the study of *Jubilees* and for appreciating broader trends in the transmission and hermeneutics of ancient Jewish texts.

THE compositional process of the book of *Jubilees* has recently become the subject of intense debate amongst scholars of Second Temple Judaism in general, and the Dead Sea scrolls in particular. Scholarship on *Jubilees* has generally followed a synoptic approach, comparing the text of *Jubilees* to the extant versions of the Pentateuch deemed closest to it. The rewritten narratives, juxtaposed legal passages, chronological framework, and additional material, including testaments and apocalyptic passages throughout the book, are aligned

with and compared to Genesis and Exodus, with any differences attributed to the so-called “author” of *Jubilees*. (1) Following this approach, each difference is catalogued and explained, with the differences attributed to exegetical or ideological-theological concerns or some combination of both. The differences are then analyzed *in toto* in order to arrive at a unified worldview of “the author” of *Jubilees*.

As I have already suggested in previous studies, the process of literary development of *Jubilees* is in fact much more complex. A number of scholars before me had already suggested that one can identify tensions and contradictions in *Jubilees* that make it difficult to view this work as the product of one author. Unfortunately, the earliest such studies, by Wiesenbergs and Davenport (in the 1960s and 1970s), (2) relating to issues of chronology and eschatology respectively, were not very convincing and led to a general dismissal of a diachronic approach with respect to *Jubilees*. However, subsequent to those publications, a series of Israeli scholars identified some significant contradictions within the book. First, Devorah Dimant noted a chronological contradiction regarding the length of the *yobel* period (to which I will return below), and posited that this tension was the result of the incorporation of extant sources into *Jubilees*. (3) Subsequently Menahem Kister identified tensions between the narratives and legal sections in two examples from the book, and suggested that the rewritten narratives and juxtaposed laws originate in different traditions, which cannot and should not be reconciled. (4)

In 2007, I published an English translation of my Hebrew University doctoral dissertation on *Jubilees*. (5) In that book, I attempted to demonstrate that the internal contradictions are both more significant

(1) The scholars that follow this approach are too numerous to detail here, but cf. especially the many foundational studies of James C. VanderKam, who has also contributed an essay to this volume. The synoptic approach is perhaps most explicit in the comparative presentation of the material in the publications of van Ruiten, such as Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000); idem, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (JSJSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

(2) Ernest Wiesenbergs, “The Jubilee of Jubilees,” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 3-40; Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971).

(3) Devorah Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 14-29, at 21, n. 17.

(4) Menahem Kister, “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; 2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 571-588.

(5) Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007; repr. Atlanta: SBL, 2012).

and frequent than previously recognized, and that these contradictions were concentrated in specific parts of the book: between the rewritten stories on the one hand, and the juxtaposed legal passages and chronological framework on the other. Chronology and law are paramount in *Jubilees*, opening with the self-reflective title “the divisions of the times of the law and of the testimony,” continuing throughout with all events dated according to a heptadic chronology (6) and with the addition of about twenty halakhic passages appended to rewritten narratives, and culminating in the concluding verse of the entire book: “so that I could write for you the laws of each specific time in every division of its times” (50:13). These overarching concerns are what give the work the impression of unity, and one feels when reading this book that it has clearly expressed central themes. However, I suggest that it is specifically against the backdrop of these highly prominent elements within the work, chronology and halakha, that one finds the internal discrepancies, between the legal and chronological passages on the one hand and the rewritten narratives on the other. The former are further differentiated from the rewritten narratives through the use of distinctive terminology.

Every composition has its share of interpretive issues, and individual contradictions can always be resolved. And certainly if the contradictions were limited to one or two interpretive cruxes, then there would be no reason to suggest an alternative, comprehensive model for the development of the book. However, the *cumulative* effect of the identified contradictions makes the possibility of individual, local solutions much less convincing. While any particular problem can be solved locally, multiple problems that share similar characteristics need to be addressed more globally. Since I published the book, I have written additional studies, adding to the list of internal discrepancies. (7) James Kugel has also argued for further examples of contradictions between the legal passages and the rewritten narratives, although he offers a different literary model to explain them than what I have proposed. (8)

(6) James C. VanderKam, “Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,” in idem, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 522-544 (trans. of idem, “Das chronologische Konzept des Jubiläenbuches,” ZAW 107 [1995]: 80-100).

(7) Michael Segal, “Rewriting the Story of Dinah and Shechem: The Literary Development of Jubilees 30,” in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 337-356 (transl. and expansion of idem, “The Literary Development of the Story of Shechem and Dinah in Jubilees 30,” *Meghillot* 8-9 [2010]: 227-241 [Hebrew]); idem, “The Literary Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees: The Chronology of Abram and Sarai’s Descent to Egypt,” *Aramaic Studies* 8 (2010): 71-88.

(8) James L. Kugel, “The Interpolations in the *Book of Jubilees*,” *RevQ* 24 (2009): 215-272; revised and expanded as idem, “The Contradictions in the *Book*

From my perspective, the chronological contradictions are especially significant because they are harder to harmonize, even on an individual level: was Dinah 9 or 12 when raped? (9) In what order were Jacob's sons born? (10) How long is a jubilee—49 or 50 years? (11) To what do the 120 years of Gen 6:3 refer? (12) When do the 10 years “after Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan” of Gen 16:3 begin—before or after he was in Egypt? (13) It is harder to resolve these kinds of questions, unless one resorts to emending the numbers that are found in the textual witnesses, (14) although this too does not work in all of the examples just enumerated. Here too, the cumulative aspect needs to be emphasized—the more cases of this category that are identified the less likely that they all reflect textual corruptions, and a broader approach is necessary.

In light of the numerous discrepancies that I identified throughout the book, and based upon the observation that they always present themselves between the rewritten texts and one of the other genres, I suggested that the author of the legal and chronological passages was not responsible for many of the rewritten narratives. Rather, this author-editor adopted these texts after they had already been reworked, and used them in the composition of his work. The contradictions between the legal passages appended to the rewritten narratives and the chronological framework in which all of the stories are embedded on the one hand, and the rewritten stories throughout the book on the other, result from the different provenance of the various texts.

While still wholeheartedly endorsing this theory of literary development, I want to offer a terminological correction to my previous studies, regarding the use of the word “redaction.” I chose this term in order to serve as a contrast with the general approach that takes *Jubilees* as a unified work and which credits its “author” with any differences from Genesis and Exodus, and instead wanted to emphasize

of Jubilees,” in idem, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 227-296. This is also the interpretive approach he adopts throughout “A Walk through *Jubilees*: An Exegetical Commentary,” in *A Walk Through Jubilees*, 1-205. See also his article in the current volume.

(9) Segal, “Rewriting the Story of Dinah,” 341-345.

(10) Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 85-91.

(11) Cf. Dimant, “The Biography” (above n. 3); Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 16-17; and see below.

(12) Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 91-93, 119-125.

(13) Segal, “The Literary Relationship,” 82-86.

(14) In reference to the birth order of Jacob's children, such emendations were posited by Hermann Röscher, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1874), 327-331; and subsequently adopted by R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 170-172.

that this writer also included extant rewritten sources in his work. However, the term “redaction” does not adequately express the extensive authorial role that I attribute to this *composer*. In addition to the sources that he adopted, the composer of Jubilees also contributed new passages, such as the opening chapter which provides a new literary framework for the pre-Sinaitic narratives, (15) and also intervened here and there in the texts that he adopted. (16) The contributions of the composer are not limited to the juxtaposed legal passages or the chronological framework, but can be further identified in those sections which are marked by similar terminology. One well-known example is the word-pair תורה ותעודה, which is found in legal passages in 2:24, 33; 3:14, and also throughout chapter 1. (17) In my opinion, the simplest conclusion is that the opening chapter was written by the same person who composed the ensuing legal passages. (18) This of course should not be a surprise, since chapter 1 serves as an introduction of the entire book, both in terms of the narrative setting, but also regarding the primary themes that are set out there, and which then play out throughout the passages that can be attributed to the composer. This proposed compositional process explains the impression of unity to which I referred above, since this composer’s contributions are what defines and sets the tone of *Jubilees*. However, this sense of unity does not erase the contradictions, which allow us to uncover the compositional process of the work as a whole. (19)

(15) The opening chapter establishes the literary framework of the book as a revelation to Moses on Sinai mediated by the angel of the presence; cf. James C. VanderKam, “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow and R.A. Werline; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000), 266-279; Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41-69; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 18-28.

(16) This adjustment still does not completely solve this terminological imprecision since the English term “composer” does not fully capture this dual function. The Hebrew term מְחַבֵּר is perhaps a more accurate description since it can describe both original composition, and revision or juxtaposition of existing materials; cf. the three meanings offered in e.g. the Even-Shoshan Hebrew dictionary, s.v. מְחַבֵּר. The same semantic observation has been emphasized by Menahem Haran with respect to the books of the Hebrew Bible; cf. M. Haran, *The Biblical Collection: Its Consolidation to the End of the Second Temple Times and Changes of Form to the End of the Middle Ages* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Magnes, 1996-2014), 1:40, 2:5 [Hebrew].

(17) On the meaning of this expression within *Jubilees*, including a discussion of alternative suggestions, see Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 282-301.

(18) In contrast with Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 280-284, who posits different connotations for this word-pair in chapter 1 versus chapters 2-3.

(19) According to the “interpolation” model subsequently proposed by James Kugel, all of the legal passages were inserted by a writer into an already extant “proto”-*Jubilees*

Jubilees and “Pseudo”-Jubilees

The current study investigates and explores the implications of this proposed literary model, based upon an examination of three Qumran scrolls known as *Pseudo-Jubilees*, and their relationship to *Jubilees*. The analysis below suggests that not only is *Jubilees* based upon extant rewritten sources, but that it itself was then subject to further rewriting. Three scrolls discovered at Qumran (4Q225-4Q227) were labeled *Pseudo-Jubilees*, first by Milik, and then published under the same title by Milik and VanderKam in DJD 13. (20) The three scrolls are all related to *Jubilees* in some way, and share with it common terminology and expressions, although due to the many differences between them and *Jubilees* they cannot be viewed as copies of the latter itself. (21) However, while all three scrolls share a relationship with *Jubilees*, there should be no *a priori* assumption that they all preserve the same composition unless they overlap with one another. As will be apparent from the following analysis, I suggest that not only are these works not all identical, but many in fact reflect fundamentally different literary relationships with the book of *Jubilees*. (22)

composition. This earlier stratum is far less interested in legal issues than the book as we have it now, although there are still legal concerns there as well (cf. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 207-221). In contrast, according to my model, there was never a book of *Jubilees* without the legal material, since the author of the legal passages was also the composer of the composition as a whole. In Kugel's view, one can remove the legal passages from *Jubilees*, and what remains is a coherent composition. I am not convinced, however, that what is left after removing the so-called “interpolations” from *Jubilees* leaves an intelligible whole (as I have expressed more extensively in Segal, “Rewriting the Story of Dinah,” 338-340, n. 7).

(20) J. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, “225-227. 4Qpseudo-Jubilees^{a-c},” in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 141-175. A scroll from Masada, consisting of a single fragment, was published by Shemaryahu Talmon as part of *Jubilees* or *Pseudo-Jubilees* (MasJub or MaspsJub); cf. S. Talmon, “Fragments of Extra-Biblical Works,” in idem, “Hebrew Fragments from Masada,” in *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 1999), 117-119, and the subsequent analyses of Esther Eshel, “Mastema's Attempt on Moses' Life in the 'Pseudo-Jubilees' Text from Masada,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 359-364; David Hamidović, *Les Traditions du Jubilé à Qumrân* (Paris: Geuthner, 2007), 269-274. The meager remains of this scroll make it essentially impossible to determine its precise relationship with *Jubilees*.

(21) VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 142.

(22) The distinction between 4Q225-226 on the one hand and 4Q227 on the other has already been suggested in the as-of yet unpublished doctoral dissertation by Atar Livneh, “The Composition Pseudo-*Jubilees* from Qumran (4Q225; 4Q226; 4Q227): A New Edition, Introduction, and Commentary,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Haifa, 2010), 203-204 [Hebrew], although she did not arrive at the same conclusions as proposed here (an English translation of her dissertation will appear in the STDJ

4Q227 (23)

4Q227 (so-called 4Qpseudo-Jubilees^c) is dated to the early Hero-dian period (final third of the first century b.c.e.), based upon paleo-graphical considerations. (24) Only two fragments survived, and the parallels to *Jubilees* are concentrated in frg. 2, which describes Enoch's activities in heaven and on earth: (25)

ח[נֹךְ אַחֵר אֲשֶׁר לַמְדִּיָּהוּ (26)] 1
שָׁשָׁה יוֹבְלֵי שָׁנִים]○[] 2
א[רְץ אֵל תּוֹךְ בְּנֵי הָאָדָם וַיַּעַד עַל כּוֹלָם] 3
[וְגַם עַל הָעִירִים וַיַּכְתּוּב אֶת כּוֹל] 4
שָׁמַיִם וְאֶת דְּרָכֵי צַבָּאָם וְאֶת[הַחֹדֶר שָׁמַיִם] 5
א[שֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁגּוּ הֵצִי דִיקָיָם]] 6

series; page references throughout this article are to the Hebrew dissertation); and Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010-2013), 2:216 [Hebrew]. Christoph Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichts-konzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 371-372, 376-378, further distinguishes between 4Q225 and 4Q226 as two distinct, but literarily related, compositions, although it seems more likely to me that they are two versions or editions of the same work (see below).

(23) The proposal here for the relationship of 4Q227 to *Jubilees* is an expansion of the brief suggestion that I put forth in "The Chronological Redaction of *Jubilees*," in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language* (ed. M. Bar-Asher et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 369-387 [Hebrew], at 372, n. 12.

(24) VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 171.

(25) The text and translation are taken from VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 173-174. The paucity of remains from frg. 1 prevents us from determining if it too was related to *Jubilees*. VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 173, record Milik's suggestion that *Jub.* 1:29-2:1 is similar to 4Q227, frg. 1, line 3, but then weaken this exclusive connection by noting similar language in other Qumran scrolls (cf. also Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 249). Livneh, "Pseudo-*Jubilees*," 190, does not mention any passage from *Jubilees* in the context of her analysis of frg. 1.

(26) J.T. Milik (ed.), *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 12; Milik and VandkerKam, DJD 13, 173-14; Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 250; Livneh, "Pseudo-*Jubilees*," 191; Qimron, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:221, note that the interlinear *nun* has been added by a second scribe, and the original text read "they taught him." The secondary insertion transformed the verb into a first person plural, "we taught him." While the original text might simply have been the result of an error in textual transmission which was then corrected, the analysis below offers an intriguing alternative explanation. If 4Q227, itself based upon texts and traditions from the Enochic corpus, was a source adopted by *Jubilees* (see below), then the description of the angelic figures who instructed Enoch in the third person plural is understandable since this is how they are presented in Enochic literature as well. The secondary addition of the interlinear *nun* would then be best explained as a "correction" of the text of 4Q227 according to the book of *Jubilees*, since the latter employs the first person plural throughout the work in order to describe angelic beings.

1. [E]noch after they^{we} taught him
2. [] [] six jubilees of years
3. [the ea]rth among the sons of mankind. And he testified against all of them.
4. [] and also against the Watchers. And he wrote all the
5. [] sky and the paths of their host and the [mon]ths
6. [s]o that the ri[g]hteous] should not err

Scholars have noted the thematic connections between this fragment and various passages from the Enochic corpus, which describe Enoch's education and behavior. (27) Even closer parallels are concentrated in one particular passage from *Jubilees*, 4:17-24, which shares language and themes with the Qumran fragment: (28)

4:17 He [Enoch] was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed patterns of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months. 4:18 He was the first to write a testimony. He testified to mankind in the generations of the earth: The weeks of the jubilees he related, and made known the

(27) Cf. e.g., Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 12,14,25; VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 174-175; Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 252-254, 282-283, 367-382; Livneh, "Pseudo-Jubilees," 195-200.

(28) The translation here (and throughout this study) is according to James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-511; Scriptorum Aethiopicarum 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Numerous scholars have also noted the parallels between Enochic literature and the *Jubilees* passage, and attempted to determine which components of this corpus were known to the "author" of *Jubilees*; cf. e.g. R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, 36-39; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 12, 24-25; James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBLSP* (1978): 229-251 (repr. in idem, *From Revelation to Canon*, 305-331); idem, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 179-188; idem, *Enoch: A Man for all Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 110-121; George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36, 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 2001), 72-76. However, as others have noted, it is methodologically difficult to demonstrate direct dependence on specific Enochic sources; cf. Dimant, "Biography," 19-24; Michael A. Knibb, "Which Parts of 1 Enoch were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25," in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines* (ed. J. Cheryl Exum and Hugh G.M. Williamson; JSOTSup 373; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 2003), 254-262; Jacques T.A.G.M. Ruiten, "A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch? A Reassessment of a Thesis of J.C. VanderKam," *Henoch* 26 (2004): 205-209. As will be suggested below, while the question is valid, it is perhaps better to formulate it with regard to the author or rewriter responsible for 4Q227. However, due to the fragmentary condition of this scroll, caution must be exercised in any case before determining the precise nature of its relationship to the Enochic corpus.

days of the years; the months he arranged, and related the sabbaths of the years, as we had told him. 4:19 While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgment. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history. 4:20 During the twelfth jubilee, in its seventh week [582-88] he took a wife for himself. Her name was Edni, the daughter of Daniel, the daughter of his father's brother. In the sixth year of this week [587] she gave birth to a son for him, and he named him Methuselah. 4:21 He was, moreover, with God's angels for six jubilees of years. They showed him everything on earth and in the heavens—the dominion of the sun—and he wrote down everything. 4:22 He testified to the Watchers who had sinned with the daughters of men because these had begun to mix with earthly women so that they became defiled. Enoch testified against all of them. 4:23 He was taken from human society, and we led him into the Garden of Eden for (his) greatness and honor. Now he is there writing down the judgment and condemnation of the world and all the wickedness of mankind. 4:24 Because of him the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment.

We can identify a parallel for each of the first five lines of the fragment in this passage from *Jubilees* 4: (29)

4Q227	<i>Jubilees</i> 4
1. [E]noch after we taught him	17: He [Enoch] was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom
2. [] <u>six jubilees of years</u>	21: <u>He was, moreover, with God's angels for six jubilees of years.</u>
3. [the ea]rth among the sons of mankind. And he testified against all of them.	18: He was the first to write a testimony. He testified to mankind in the generations of the earth. 19: He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history.

(29) These parallels have been noted previously; cf. e.g. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 12; VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 2:26-27; VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 174-175; Berner, *Jahre*, 375; Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 252-254, 282-283, 367-376; Livneh, "Pseudo-Jubilees," 192-201.

4Q227	<i>Jubilees</i> 4
4. [] and also against the Watchers. And he wrote all the	22: He testified to the Watchers who had sinned with the daughters of men 21: he wrote down everything
5. [] sky and the paths of their host and the [mon]ths	17: who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed patterns of their months. 18: and made known the days of the years; the months he arranged... 21: They showed him everything on earth and in the heavens—the dominion of the sun...

In light of these numerous parallels, the almost inescapable conclusion is that this Qumran fragment is literarily related to the passage in *Jubilees*. However, despite the similarities, due to difference in formulation, order and content, they are clearly not the same composition. Is there any way for us to determine the nature and direction of the relationship between them?

Almost all scholars who have analyzed 4Q227 have concluded (or assumed) that it is dependent upon or reflects a reworking of *Jubilees*. (30) I would like to suggest that in this case the direction of development should be reversed, because it can in fact be demonstrated that *Jubilees* is dependent upon the composition preserved in the Qumran fragment (or upon a literary ancestor or descendant of this composition). (31) In her study of the *Jubilees* passage under discussion here, Devorah Dimant identified a deviation in the length of the period known as a “jubilee” in *Jubilees* 4:21 when compared to the rest of the book. (32) According to the many dates throughout

(30) Cf. e.g. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 14; Berner, *Jahre*, 365-366 (esp. n. 132), 374-375 (esp. n. 176); Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 282-283, 372. Due to their similarity in content and style, Dimant, “Biography,” 22, n. 22, suggests that 4Q227 2 is in fact a variant form of *Jubilees* itself. Livneh, “Pseudo-*Jubilees*,” 201-202, after noting their striking similarities in language, style, themes and structure, suggests, in light of the differences between them, either that both *Jubilees* and 4Q227 2 are literarily dependent upon a third, conjectured source, or that the author of 4Q227 reworked the *Jubilees* passage, incorporating additional traditions about Enoch’s career.

(31) Since the specific manuscript, 4Q227, is dated to final third of the 1st century B.C.E. (cf. above n. 24), the process of literary development suggested here leads to the conclusion that the scroll is a later copy of an earlier work (prior to the composition of *Jubilees* in the 2nd century B.C.E.).

(32) Cf. above, notes 3, 11.

the chronological framework of *Jubilees*, the length of a “jubilee” period is 49 years. Thus, for example *Jub.* 10:16 describes the length of Noah’s life:

He completed 950 years in his lifetime—19 jubilees, two weeks, and five years.

This equation is valid only if a “jubilee” period is 49 years long:

$$(19 * 49) + (2 * 7) + 5 = 931 + 14 + 5 = 950$$

The only exception in the entire book to this conception of the jubilee period is 4:21, which describes Enoch’s sojourn with the angels following his son’s birth:

He was, moreover, with God’s angels for six jubilees of years.

This verse is parallel to the period described in Gen 5:22:

וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנֹךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־מֶתוּשֶׁלַח שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה.

Enoch walked with God, after the birth of Methuselah, 300 years.

A simple calculation reveals that according to *Jub.* 4:21, a “jubilee” period lasts for 50 years, in contrast to the value elsewhere in the book. Some scholars have attempted to harmonize this verse with the rest of the book, according to which Enoch only spent 294 years in heaven ($6 * 49$), and returned to earth 6 years prior to his death. (33) However, this argument is unconvincing, since it adds new, seemingly crucial, information to the story. Both interpretations of the length of a “jubilee,” 49 or 50 years, are attested in ancient sources, both stemming from the interpretation of Leviticus 25. Instead, as Dimant suggested, “this shows that *Jubilees* borrows from various sources, often without reconciling the contradictions.” (34) It is most likely that *Jub.* 4:17-24 emerged from a different writer than the author of the chronological framework of the book, since the author of framework, who is consistently precise in his calculations, would not have presented the

(33) James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 121, n. 18; idem, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 33; George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 74; James M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 23-71; Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 372.

(34) Cf. above n. 3.

300 year period as 6 jubilees. If this author would not have formulated it in this way, then he perhaps appropriated it from an extant source, which was formulated along the lines of 4Q227 2. Since this Qumran fragment, which is itself a rewriting of Enochic traditions, was a source adopted by *Jubilees*, it would be more appropriate to rename the scroll 4Q**proto-Jubilees**, or perhaps even 4Q**Reworked Enoch**, instead of 4Qpseudo-*Jubilees*.

4Q225-226

The other two scrolls published as *Pseudo-Jubilees*, 4Q225-226, preserve some close parallels between them (4Q225, frg. 2, and 4Q226, frg. 7), which strongly suggests that these are two versions of the same composition. (35) Both scrolls can be dated paleographically to the Herodian period, with 4Q225 copied between 50 b.c.e. and 20 c.e., and 4Q226 between 50-25 b.c.e.. (36) In this context, I do not intend to analyze these fragmentary scrolls in their entirety, but rather to focus on perhaps its most well-known passage, which presents a rewritten version of the Aqedah story (Gen 22), with emphasis on one aspect of the narrative. The Aqedah story in pseudo-*Jubilees* is clearly related to the version in *Jubilees*, primarily due to the addition of an evil heavenly character known as Mastema (etymologically and typologically close to Satan). According to *Jubilees* 17-18 it was not God who came up with the idea that Abraham needed to be tested but rather Mastema:

17:15 During the seventh week, in the first year during the first month—on the twelfth of this month—in this jubilee [2003], there were voices

(35) VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 153-154, 165-166; James C. VanderKam, "The Aqedah, *Jubilees*, and PseudoJubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. C.A. Evans and S. Talmon; Biblical Interpretation 28; Brill: Leiden, 1997), 241-261, at 244; Livneh, "Pseudo-*Jubilees*," 151-154, 219-230. In contrast, Berner, *Jahre*, 371-372, 376-378, views them as two distinct, but literarily related, compositions. Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 275, similarly has reservations about referring to the two manuscripts as "copies" of the same work, due to the variation in the parallel passages, and therefore also posits that one developed from the other. However due to their close relationship, he analyzes them as a unit throughout the book (e.g. pp. 275-281, 318-328). While I tend to accept the argument that 4Q225 and 4Q226 reflect two different versions of the same composition, due to the fragmentary nature of these scrolls it is difficult to determine their precise relationship. Since the Aqedah is preserved more completely in 4Q225 than in 4Q226, I refer to the former throughout the discussion below.

(36) VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 139, 157.

(or: words) (37) in heaven regarding Abraham, that he was faithful in everything that he had told him, (that) the Lord loved him, and (that) in every difficulty he was faithful. 17:16 Then Prince Mastema came and said before God: 'Abraham does indeed love his son Isaac and finds him more pleasing than anyone else. Tell him to offer him as a sacrifice on an altar. Then you will see whether he performs this order and will know whether he is faithful in everything through which you test him'. 17:17 Now the Lord was aware that Abraham was faithful in every difficulty which he had told him. ... 17:18 In everything through which he tested him he was found faithful. He himself did not grow impatient, nor was he slow to act; for he was faithful and one who loved the Lord.

The *Jubilees* version thus solves two theological problems in one fell swoop—first, it removes the suggestion that God is evil, or at least removes him another degree from the proposal of this evil test; second, there is no suggestion that God does not know the result of Abraham's test. In fact, *Jubilees* states explicitly that God knew that Abraham was faithful, and the only purpose of the entire ordeal was to make this known to the rest of the world (*Jub.* 18:16). (38) The attribution of the initiative to Mastema, a Satan-like figure, is a literary appropriation from the narrative frame of the book of Job (cf. also *LAB* 32 and *b.Sanh.* 89b). (39)

In addition to the insertion of Mastema into the narrative, the rewritten story in *Jubilees* capitalizes on another detail in Genesis 22, the presence of the מלאך ה' in vv. 11, 15, who twice speaks directly to Abraham, first to prevent him from slaughtering his son, and then again to bless him for his loyalty and willingness to offer his son to God. In the biblical narrative, there does not appear to be a clearly demarcated distinction between this מלאך and God himself, and the

(37) As suggested by Menahem Kister, "Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 1-34, at 9-10, and 26-27, n. 39.

(38) For an analysis of the theological implications of the *Jubilees* version of the Aqedah story, see my discussion in Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 189-191.

(39) Cf. e.g., Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "Abraham, Job and the Book of *Jubilees*: The Intertextual Relationship of Genesis 22:1-19, Job 1:1-2:13 and *Jubilees* 17:15-18:19," in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (ed. E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar; Themes in Biblical Narrative 4; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 58-85; Deborah Dimant, "The Biblical Basis of Non-Biblical Additions: The Sacrifice of Isaac in *Jubilees* in Light of the Story of Job," in *Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. D. Sivan et al.; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2009), 117-140 [Hebrew]; repr. in idem, *Connected Vessels: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2010), 348-368.

former speaks in the voice of the latter: “since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from *me*” (v. 12; cf. vv. 15-16) and “because you have obeyed *my* voice” (v. 18). However, in Second Temple literature, and particularly in *Jubilees*, this מלאך was transformed into an independent entity, who works in concert with, but separately from, God. The empowerment of this angelic figure helps solve the question of God’s foreknowledge, since it is in fact the angel who did not know the results of Abraham’s test in advance: (40)

18:11 I [the angel of presence] said to him: Do not lay your hands on the child and do not do anything to him because I now know that you are one who fears the Lord. You have not refused me your first-born son’.

The מלאך ה’ in Genesis 22 is identified with the angel of the presence, who is the first-person speaker throughout *Jubilees*. (41) The scene in *Jubilees* can thus be summarized as a relatively simple hierarchy of divine figures, with God at its head, and the angel of the presence and Mastema battling against one another to see whether Abraham will remain loyal to the divine command. This competition reaches its peak, when Abraham passes the test with flying colors, and therefore “the prince of Mastema was put to shame” (*Jub.* 18:12).

The rewritten narrative in *Jubilees* can be compared to that in 4Q225, fragment 2: (42)

Fragment 2, Column i

[ב]אלו[הי]ם ותחשב לו צדקה ויולד בן אח[רי] כן	8
[לאברהם] ויקרא את שמו יסחק ויבוא שר המ[ש]טמה	9
אל אל[והים] ושטים את אברהם בישחק ויאמר [א]לוהים	10
אל אבר[הם] קח את בנכה את ישחק את יחיד[כה אשר]	11
אתה אהב[תה] והעלהו לי לעולה על אחד ההרים [הגבוהים]	12
אשר אומר[לכה] ויק[ום] וי[לך] מן הבארות על ה[ר מוריה]	13
[] [] ל[] וישא אב[רהם] את	14

(40) VanderKam, “The Aqedah,” 251; James L. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 172-173; idem, *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 302-303; idem, *A Walk Through Jubilees*, 110-112.

(41) As observed by James C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 378-393, at 388-390, this interchange is a characteristic exegetical feature in *Jubilees* (chapter 18 is discussed on p. 389).

(42) The text and translation are taken from Vanderkam and Milik, DJD 13, 145-154 (with corrections and minimal reconstructions). This fragment (starting in col. ii, l. 8) overlaps to some degree with 4Q226, frg. 7.

Fragment 2, Column ii

- 1 [עִי]נִין וְהִנֵּה אֵשׁ וְ[י]תָן]
 2 וַיֹּאמֶר יִשְׁחַק אֶל אַבְרָהָם
 3 לְעֹלָה וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם אֵלַי
 4 לֹא אִמַּר יִשְׁחַק אֶל אָבִיו כֹּן
 5 מִלֹּאכִי קֹדֶשׁ עֹמְדִים בֹּכִים עַל
 6 אֶת בְּנִי מִן הָאָרֶץ וּמִלֹּאכִי הֵמָּה שְׂטֵמָה
 7 שְׂמֵחִים וְאוֹמְרִים עֲכָשׁוּ יֶאֱבֹד וְ
 8 יִמְצָא כֹחַשׁ וְאֵם לֹא יִמְצָא נֶאֱמָן אֵן
 9 אַבְרָהָם אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְנִי וַיֹּאמֶר עַתָּה יָדַעְתִּי
 10 לֹא יִהְיֶה אֹהֶב וַיְבָרֶךְ אֶל יְהוָה אֵת יֵשׁ חַק
 11 יַעֲקֹב וַיַּעֲקֹב הוֹלִיד אֶת לִוי דֹּוֹר

Col. i

8. [in] G[o]d, and righteousness was accounted to him. A son was born af[ter] this
 9. [to Abra]h[m], and he named him Isaac. Then the Prince of the Ma[s]temah came
 10. [to G]od, and he accused Abraham regarding Isaac. And [G]od said
 11. [to Abra]ham: ‘Take your son, Isaac, [your] onl[y] one whom
 12. you [love] and offer him to me as a whole burnt-offering on one of the [high] mountains
 13. [which I will designate] for you. And he got [up and w]en[t] from the wells up to M[t. Moriah]
 14. []/[] And Ab[raham] lifted

Col. ii

1. [his ey]es [and there was a] fire, and [he] se[t
 2. Isaac said to Abraham [
 3. for the whole burnt-offering?’ Abraham said to [
 4. for himself.’ Isaac said to his father k[
 5. The angels of holiness were standing weeping above [
 6. his sons from the earth. The angels of the Ma[s]temah
 7. being happy and saying, ‘Now he will perish.’ And[
 8. he would fail, and whether he would not be found faithful t[o God.
 9. ‘Abraham, Abraham!’ He said, ‘Here I am.’ He said ‘N[ow I know
 10. he will not be “one who loves (God)”.’ God the Lord blessed Is[aac
 11. Jacob, and Jacob became the father of Levi, [a third] genera[tion

There are a number of explicit parallels to the *Jubilees* version, most prominently the attribution of the suggested test to “the Prince of (the) Mastema” in col. i, lines 9-10. Similarly, the terms נֶאֱמָן (col. ii, line 8) and אֹהֶב (col. ii, line 10), both in reference to Abraham’s

loyalty also play a prominent role in the *Jubilees* account (cf. *Jub.* 17:15-18; underlined above). (43) These shared expressions and themes demonstrate that these scrolls are literarily related to the book of *Jubilees*. (44)

Here too, we can ask whether it is possible to establish the direction of dependence between the two compositions. In this case, the answer can be suggested based upon a significant difference between them. As already noted, according to *Jubilees* 17-18, there are two heavenly figures in addition to God, Mastema and the angel of the presence. In contrast, this passage from *Pseudo-Jubilees* describes additional heavenly figures, in 4Q225 2 ii 5-7, including the “angels of holiness” and the “angels of (the) Mastema”. The former cry due to the situation in which Abraham and Isaac find themselves, and the latter are happy because they are certain Abraham will fail this test, demonstrating his lack of faithfulness.

How are we to understand the multiplication of divine figures in the scroll vis-à-vis *Jubilees*? It should be noted that numerous sources from antiquity describe the presence of a plurality of angels at the Aqedah scene. (45) The roles of these angelic groups differ from composition to composition. Thus, for example, in *LAB* 32:1-4 and *Gen. Rab.* 55:4 a group of ministering angels takes the place of Mastema in *Jubilees* 17:15-18 (and Satan in *b. Sanh.* 89b) in goading God to test Abraham. (46) The Palestinian Targumim to Gen 22:10 describe

(43) The term אֱמוּנָה, used here as a synonym for נֶאֱמָן, carries the meaning “loyal” throughout Deuteronomy, where it refers to loyalty to the covenant, and is borrowed from ancient Near Eastern treaty terminology; cf. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 292-294 for discussion of the origins and meaning of this term, and its use in *Jubilees* and Qumran literature. This interpretation has been recently adopted by Moshe J. Bernstein, “Where are the Patriarchs in the Literature of Qumran?,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz; BZAW 439; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 51-76, at 57-58. Abraham is already referred to as “one who loves (ב-ה-א)” God in Isa 41:8; 2 Chr 20:7; cf. Kugel, *Traditions*, 258 who documents the extensive use of this description for Abraham in early Jewish and Christian sources.

(44) Contra Livneh, “Pseudo-Jubilees,” 166-187 (esp. p. 187), who refrains from positing a literary dependence between the two, but rather views 4Q225-226 as an independent composition, different from *Jubilees*. However, dependence does not imply identity, and therefore the differences between the compositions are less significant than the shared themes and language.

(45) These sources were assembled and thoroughly analyzed both by Kister, “Observations,” 7-15, 20; and subsequently Moshe J. Bernstein, “Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 263-291. These two studies provide a comprehensive assessment of this material, and therefore I have only briefly summarized the results here.

(46) Kister, “Observations,” 8-14; Bernstein, “Angels,” 270-275. Kister is undoubtedly correct that the Mastema/Satan tradition, modelled on the narrative frame

the angels in heaven witnessing the events on Mount Moriah, and praising Abraham and Isaac's devotion. (47) *Genesis Rabbah* 56:5,7,10 (and later rabbinic sources) describes the ministering angels crying at the Aqedah, providing a striking parallel to the same motif in 4Q225 2 ii 5. (48) The appearance of multiple angelic figures is thus not unique to the version of the story in 4Q225, and perhaps reflects this tradition which is broadly attested in Jewish sources in antiquity. At the same time, the specific manifestation of this motif, in which two opposing groups of good and evil angels compete against each other in a dualistic setting, is unique to the account of the Aqedah in 4Q225 and therefore needs explanation.

Some scholars have attempted to identify a textual trigger in *Jubilees* 18 that led the author of 4Q225 to expand the roles of the individual divine figures so that they lead groups of opposing angels, who were also present at this momentous event. VanderKam and Milik suggested that this expansion is based upon a reading of *Jubilees* 18:14: "The Lord again called to Abraham by his name from heaven, just as *we* had appeared in order to speak to him in the Lord's name." In contrast to vv. 10-11, where the angel of presence calls out to Abraham, here God speaks directly to Abraham, just as the angel(s) had done so previously. (49) The use of the 1st person plural pronoun in

of Job, is the earlier version of this motif, and it has been replaced secondarily by the multiple angels motif. At the same time, its attestation in *LAB* demonstrates that it too is an early tradition.

(47) Bernstein, "Angels," 277-278; Florentino García Martínez, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225," in *The Sacrifice of Isaac*, 44-57, at 54.

(48) Kister, "Observations," 20, was the first to read בּוֹכִים based upon the PAM photographs, and correctly identified the subsequent rabbinic parallel (according to VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 150, Milik had originally read בְּיָמַי); cf. also Bernstein, "Angels," 278-283; James L. Kugel, "Exegetical Notes on 4Q225," *DSD* 13 (2006): 73-98; repr. in idem, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 365-390, at 367-370 (the references to that article in this study are according to the reprinted version). This intriguing parallel raises the question of the relationship between 4Q225 and the subsequent rabbinic traditions—is the tradition recorded first in this Qumran scroll an ancestor of the later rabbinic sources, or are they both independent manifestations of an earlier tradition? The issue is further complicated by the quotation of Isa 33:7 as a prooftext for crying angels in the rabbinic sources, while it is absent in 4Q225. Was the seemingly unrelated verse associated secondarily to an early, extant tradition (Bernstein, "Angels," 279-280; Kugel, "Exegetical Notes," 370), or was it perhaps part and parcel of the creation of the motif itself (Menahem Kister, "Body and Purification from Evil: Prayer Formulas and Concepts in Second Temple Literature and the their Relationship to Later Rabbinic Literature," *Meghillot* 8-9 [2010]: 243-284 [Hebrew] at 261, n. 88, developing a brief note in idem, "Observations," 34, n. 91; Livneh, "Pseudo-*Jubilees*," 103)?

(49) The attribution of this speech act to God instead of the angel (against all of the extant textual witnesses to Gen 22:15 that read the "angel of YHWH") is perhaps

this context “assumes a larger group of angels.” (50) This peculiarity would perhaps partially explain the profusion of angels in 4Q225, although ostensibly it only refers to the “angels of the presence” and not to their evil counterparts. In a similar vein, in the context of an extensive study on exegetical aspects of 4Q225, James Kugel has suggested that the competing divine groups are the result of the author of 4Q225’s interpretation of a different difficulty in *Jubilees* 18. According to *Jub.* 18:16, following the blessing that Abraham received due to his faithfulness, God declared that, “I have made known *to everyone* that you are faithful to me in everything that I have told you... .” Kugel suggests that an early reader was troubled by a simple question—to whom exactly did God make known that Abraham was faithful? (51) The only characters present at the scene in addition to Abraham were Mastema, the angel of the presence, and Isaac. He therefore suggests that the author of 4Q225 created the extra angels in order to fill the role of “everyone,” thereby resolving this potential interpretive issue. (52) Both of these suggested textual triggers lead to the conclusion that *Pseudo-Jubilees* is dependent upon, and even interprets, *Jubilees*.

Whether or not these traditions and textual clues were the direct source for the theological scheme at the Aqedah story in 4Q225, I suggest that this division into “angels of holiness” and “angels of Mastema” is completely at home within the broader theological context

the result of the formulation of Gen 22:16, which explicitly attributes the contents of the statement to Him נִאֻם ה' “says YHWH”. The formulation in *Jub.* 18:14, which adds a comparison of God’s speech to the angel’s prior communication, clarifies the adverb שְׁנִית “a second time” (Gen 22:15), which in its original context refers to the second time that the angel spoke to Abraham. Once God replaced the angel as the subject of this sentence in *Jubilees*, it became necessary to explain that vv. 14–16 were in fact a continuation of the angel’s words in vv. 10–11, since according to the division of labor in *Jubilees*, the implicit reference to God’s first speech act could perhaps have been misconstrued to refer to God’s commandment to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac at the beginning of the chapter (*Jub.* 18:1 || Gen 22:1). Cf. also Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 111.

(50) VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13, 152; Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 220. For a discussion of the textual difficulties in the Ethiopic and Latin translations of this verse, see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:108.

(51) As noted by Kugel, “Exegetical Notes,” 372, in the context of *Jubilees* itself, this detail in the text is not in fact problematic, since the sentence “I have made known *to everyone*” does not necessarily refer only to those present at the scene, but more likely refers to everyone who will one day read or hear the story of Abraham’s faithfulness. However, this does not negate Kugel’s suggestion since it is possible that an early reader did find this textual detail troubling.

(52) Kugel, “Exegetical Notes,” 370–373.

of *Jubilees* as a complete composition, augmenting the cosmological dualism already present in chapter 18 according to the contours of other passages elsewhere in *Jubilees*. (53) I have previously posited that the rewritten story of the Aqedah in chapters 17-18 was an extant passage that was incorporated into *Jubilees*. The primary argument for this conclusion relates to the calendrical background of the story, and is beyond the discussion here. (54) When one reads the *Jubilees* Aqedah story in isolation from the rest of the book, the cosmological-theological picture described there is both logical and symmetrical, God above and two competing angels below him. However, if one reads the same story in the larger context of the book of *Jubilees* in its entirety then a different picture emerges, since in other passages we find a more developed dualistic heavenly system, including additional groups of angels, good and bad: (55)

Angels of Presence/Holiness

2:2 For on the first day he created ... the angels of the presence; the angels of holiness...

2:18 He told us—all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness (these two great kinds)—to keep sabbath with him in heaven and on earth.

15:27 For this is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels.

31:14 May the Lord give you and your descendants extremely great honor; may he make you and your descendants (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones...

(53) Kugel, "Exegetical Notes," 370-373 (quoting Kister) notes how this scheme "is altogether in keeping with the dualism characteristic of so much of the Qumran writings"; cf. also Hamidović, *Les Traditions*, 221; Livneh, "Pseudo-*Jubilees*," 81, 83, 103. I am certainly in agreement with this statement, but think it should be applied first and foremost to *Jubilees* itself.

(54) See Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 191-2092; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 240-242. VanderKam, "The Aqedah," 244-248 offers a different approach to resolve this calendrical tension.

(55) For a thorough discussion of the angelology of *Jubilees*, cf. Devorah Dimant, "Sons of Heaven—Angelology in the Book of Jubilees in Light of the Qumran Sectarian Writings," in *Tribute to Sara: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Kabbala Presented to Prof. Sara Heller Wilensky* (ed. M. Idel, D. Dimant and S. Rosenberg; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 97-118 [Hebrew]; repr. in idem, *Connected Vessels*, 141-160.

Spirits/Forces of Mastema

10:8 When Mastema, the leader of the spirits, came, he said: ‘Lord creator, leave some of them before me... 10:9 Then he said that a tenth of them should be left before him, while he would make nine parts descend to the place of judgment. 10:10 ... All of the evil ones who were savage we tied up in the place of judgment, while we left a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan.

11:5 Prince Mastema was exerting his power in effecting all these actions and, by means of the spirits, he was sending to those who were placed under his control (the ability) to commit every (kind of) error and sin and every (kind of) transgression; to corrupt, to destroy, and to shed blood on the earth.

19:28 May the spirits of Mastema not rule over you and your descendants to remove you from following the Lord who is your God from now and forever.

49:2 For on this night—it was the beginning of the festival and the beginning of joy—you were eating the passover in Egypt when all the forces of Mastema were sent to kill every first-born in the land of Egypt—from the pharaoh’s first-born to the first-born of the captive slave-girl at the millstone and to the cattle as well.

In my opinion, this distinction with respect to the conceptions of the heavenly retinue, between the Aqedah story and the rest of the book, is the result of the complex process by which *Jubilees* developed, including the combination of material from different hands and authors. Anyone who read *Jubilees* as an authoritative, canonical, unified work needed to harmonize the tensions between its different sections. And if in most passages in the book one finds groups of “angels of presence” and/or “angels of holiness” on the one hand, and “spirits/forces of Mastema” on the other, then a synchronic reading of *Jubilees* leads to the conclusion that the same groups were present in the Aqedah story as well, alongside their leaders, the angel of presence and Mastema. This is precisely the picture in 4Q225. If so, then 4Q225 is dependent upon *Jubilees* in its current, complex form, and is therefore certainly secondary to the rewritten story in *Jubilees* 17-18. Since 4Q225 (and 4Q226) rewrote *Jubilees*, it would perhaps be best to refer to them as 4QReworked/Rewritten *Jubilees*. (56)

(56) As VanderKam, “The Aqedah,” 242, 259-261, has highlighted, the title “Pseudo-”*Jubilees* is somewhat of a misnomer, since the modifier “pseudo-” is generally reserved for those instances when one composition either imitates or is mistaken for another, neither of which is the case here.

The process described here for 4Q225-226 is the opposite of that suggested above for 4Q227, which was determined to be a source used by *Jubilees*. Although the works preserved in these scrolls are both related to *Jubilees*, the analysis here suggests that they reflect very different stages in its literary development, from a source employed in the composition of the book, to its subsequent interpretation and rewriting.

Rewriting and Composition

What is at stake in the current debate about the composition of *Jubilees*? Why does the specific model of literary development make a difference? I want to highlight two important implications of this debate, the first specific to the study of *Jubilees* and the second significant for appreciating broader trends in the transmission and hermeneutics of ancient Jewish texts.

Focusing first on *Jubilees*, the recognition that its composer has adopted extant texts and included them in his work obviates the need for harmonistic reading and interpretation of passages in the book. Kister already demonstrated this in a study of the contradictory *halakhot* found within *Jubilees*, where he showed that scholars such as Albeck and Baumgarten both interpreted the rewritten narratives and legal passages so that they matched one another. Instead, each can and should be interpreted on its own terms. (57) Dimant's insight (discussed above) regarding the length of the jubilee period in *Jubilees* is particularly instructive for appreciating the complex background of the sources and/or traditions incorporated in *Jubilees*. The list of further contradictions and tensions identified by myself and Kugel, in particular between the narrative passages and the legal or chronological sections, should be assessed in the same fashion, instead of attempting to harmonize originally disparate materials. Similar methodological caution and precision should be applied to issues of theological import, such as the analysis of the approach(es) to the issue of the origin of evil in *Jubilees*, one of the primary theological topics of interest both in Antiquity and today. Only by analyzing each passage on its own is it possible to understand the fundamental assertions expressed in each one. In a few

(57) Kister, "Some Aspects", 577-578, in response to Chanoch Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* (Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 27; Berlin: Siegfried Scholem, 1930), 3-60, at 32-33; and Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Laws of Orlah and First Fruits in Light of Jubilees, the Qumran Writings, and Targum Ps. Jonathan," *JJS* 38 (1987): 195-202, at 196-198, esp. n. 20; cf. also Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 17-19.

instances, such as in the direct literary use of the *Book of Watchers* in *Jubilees* 5, it can be demonstrated that a passage which expresses a theological approach at odds with that of the composer of *Jubilees* was in fact adopted from an extant source. (58) In order to avoid painting a muddled picture of the worldview of this composer, it is imperative therefore to distinguish between the sources that he employed and his own contributions.

However, more fundamentally, I suggest that the precise analysis of the composition of *Jubilees*, and the comparison here with the so-called *Pseudo-Jubilees* texts, opens up a window onto the dynamic processes of creation, transmission and interpretation of scriptural texts in Ancient Judaism. Many of the works that are generally included by scholars in the category of Rewritten Bible, and *Jubilees* is one such paradigmatic composition, *do not actually reflect a direct rewriting of the Bible*, in which an author sat with a biblical text in front of him, which he then reworked as he saw fit. As already noted above, many studies of *Jubilees* in fact assume such a synoptic approach, placing the Rewritten Bible composition (*Jubilees*) in one column and a text of the Bible in the other, and highlighting and explaining the differences between them. However, I suggest that the insight into the compositional process of *Jubilees* that emerges from this investigation of the relationship between *Jubilees* and 4Q225-227 demonstrates that this reflects a narrow, static perspective of the process of rewriting. In addition to reworking Genesis and Exodus, *Jubilees* also incorporated already rewritten sources (e.g. 4Q227), as part of a much more complex literary development, that also included original contributions of this *composer*. The composition of *Jubilees* did not, however, signal an end to this literary process, and later authors (4Q225-226) continued to create new compositions by reworking *Jubilees*. When seen in this light, it can be suggested that many of these so-called “rewritten” Bible compositions are in fact but one moment in an ongoing, dynamic process of rewriting, reformulating and reshaping, in which subsequent scribes and authors appropriated and reworked extant texts, some of which perhaps conformed to the shape of the biblical texts of which we are currently aware, while others were already revisions/rewritings of these biblical books. In many instances, one such composition rewrites another. This multifaceted literary growth suggests that the term “rewritten” Bible is only accurate if we choose to ignore the complexity of the compositional processes in question, and instead focus on a direct comparison of the “rewritten” work with the known textual witnesses of the

(58) Cf. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 83-143.

Bible. Instead of Rewritten Bible, as coined by Vermes, (59) I suggest that we should speak of *Rewriting* the Bible in order to reflect this dynamic process, which perhaps commenced with a biblical text as its starting point, (60) but soon grew in different directions with different scribes contributing toward its cumulative development. When analyzed in this light, the results of the study of the composition of *Jubilees* become a paradigm for the textual growth and development of ancient Jewish literature, and should cause us to rethink models of scribal activity that fueled these complex processes. This topic therefore has significance beyond the interpretation of specific passages in *Jubilees*, and sheds light on some of the most fundamental questions in biblical studies.

Michael SEGAL

(59) Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961), 95. Among the many subsequent studies on Rewritten Bible compositions, see e.g. George W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. Stone; CRINT; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984), 89-156; Daniel J. Harrington, "The Bible Rewritten," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 239-247; Phillip S. Alexander, "Re-telling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99-121; Emanuel Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334-354; Sidnie White Crawford, "The 'Rewritten' Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts," *Eretz Israel* 26 (1999): 1-8; George J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:277-281; George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London/New Castle: British Library/Oak Knoll, 2002), 31-40; Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196; Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28; Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; Library of Second Temple Studies 63; London: T & T Clark, 2007); Anders K. Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285-306; Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

(60) The same argument for a multi-stage, dynamic compositional process can also be applied to the formative stages of biblical literature. The canonical forms of these works would then be better conceived as individual static moments in a chain or web of ever-developing works. That discussion though is beyond the scope of this study.

THE QUMRAN *JUBILEES* MANUSCRIPTS AS EVIDENCE FOR THE LITERARY GROWTH OF THE BOOK (1)

Summary

Whereas scholarship generally assumes a fixed text of *Jubilees* by the second century B.C.E., this article explores the evidence for first-century B.C.E. revisions and *Fortschreibungen*. The combined evidence of 4Q216 and 4Q217 hints at a first-century B.C.E. addition to *Jub.* 1, and the absence of *Jub.* 23:32 from 4Q176 frag. 21 may indicate subsequent *Fortschreibung*. The article argues, following Milik, for a manuscript bisection of *Jubilees*, and for a reassignment of 4Q176 frag. 21 to 4Q221. An appendix presents the hitherto unpublished fragment 4Q221 frag. 20.

1. Previous Use of the Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts in *Jubilees* Research

BEFORE the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the book of *Jubilees* was only known from Ethiopic manuscripts including the *maṣṣāḥafa kūfāle* or “Book of Divisions,” from a fragmentarily preserved Latin translation, and from Greek citations from or allusions to the work most often referred to as ἡ λεπτή Γένεσις, generally translated as “The Little Genesis,” but more likely to have meant “The Detailed Genesis.” Since only the Ethiopic presents a complete text, that text has been the basis for literary and historical analyses. The Latin manuscripts and Greek quotations were used mainly for additional text-critical evidence. The discovery of the very fragmentary Hebrew *Jubilees* manuscripts from Qumran has not altered this approach substantially, and most scholars of *Jubilees* refer to the Hebrew manuscript evidence

(1) It is a pleasure to dedicate this paper to Marc Vervenne, who welcomed Dead Sea Scrolls research at the KU Leuven, on the occasion of his retirement in 2014 as professor of Old Testament.

only occasionally. The debates about the composition of *Jubilees* thus remain largely based on the text of the Ethiopic version. The evidence of the so-called *Pseudo-Jubilees* manuscripts (4Q225-4Q227) is sometimes used in discussions about the compositional history of *Jubilees*, but only rarely the evidence of the so-called *Jubilees* manuscripts.

The attention given to the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts has been mainly text critical and textual in nature. In this regard VanderKam's research has been very influential. Based on the small sample of the then published Dead Sea Scrolls *Jubilees* fragments, VanderKam concluded in 1977 that the "text of Jub. which the Ethiopic manuscripts provide is very accurate and reliable. It reproduces the Hebrew text (*via* a Greek intermediate stage) literally and precisely in nearly all cases," and that the few variants "are nearly all minor in character and even debatable in some cases." (2) The subsequent publication of the more extensive textual evidence of the Qumran Cave 4 *Jubilees* manuscripts, which VanderKam published in the 1990s with J. T. Milik, (3) "reinforced those conclusions, although there are indeed differences between the Hebrew and Ethiopic readings in a number of details." (4) Such differences are, however, not fully recorded. In DJD 13, the editors have generally reconstructed the lost text on the basis of retroversion from the Ethiopic. In some cases where they did not do so, as in 4Q216 VII 6-7, this is because of "major textual difficulties" which show that a "major deviation separates the two versions" (namely that of the Ethiopic and of 4Q216). (5) However, in other cases (e.g., 4Q216 II 14-17) the positioning of the preserved words in the fully reconstructed lines does not match with the fragmentary manuscript evidence, indicating a difference between the versions which is only hinted at in the comments. (6) Textually, the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments provide the original Hebrew wording of some important words and expressions. This goes, for example, for the Ethiopic expression *ḥəgg wa-səm'*, "law and testimony," which now with certainty can be read as תורה ותעודה.

(2) James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 94.

(3) Joint publication by James VanderKam and Józef Milik, preliminarily in various articles since 1991, and principally in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part I* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

(4) James C. VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 3-21 at 10.

(5) DJD 13:21.

(6) DJD 13:11: "If the text here and at the beginning of line 15 is properly restored, line 14 would be left rather short ... but the Ethiopic version contains no additional words." Note that the problem also pertains to the too short number of words between the remains of lines 15 and 16.

Because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, they have rarely been used for literary or historical arguments. One exception is 4Q216, written in two hands, the oldest of which is dated by VanderKam to ca. 125-100 B.C.E., and by Milik "nearer to the mid-second century B.C.E." (7) For VanderKam this indicates that 4Q216 "comes from a period not far removed from the time when *Jubilees* was written." (8) For Kugel, this suggests that "one should situate the time of the book's composition no later than the middle of the second century." (9) Another exception concerns the number of the *Jubilees* manuscripts. Even a cautious count of fourteen *Jubilees* manuscripts gives the highest number of manuscripts of any given non-biblical text. As a result many scholars have argued for the authoritativeness or the popularity of this work at Qumran.

The Qumran manuscript evidence has rarely been referenced in the discussions about the literary composition of the work. This is due to the fragmentary nature of the material, which preserves material from less than half of the chapters of *Jubilees* (and sometimes only a few verses or words from those chapters), and has very few cases where one and the same section is covered by two or more manuscripts. (10) It is also due to suppositions regarding the authorship, date, and composition of *Jubilees* in relation to the Qumran evidence. Many scholars have assumed on literary grounds a final composition of the work, sometimes stated to have been composed by one single author, (11) before the oldest Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts, and therefore have interpreted the manuscript evidence accordingly. This essay will look anew at some of the manuscript evidence in relation to the literary or compositional theories. (12) I am indebted to some older suggestions by Charlotte Hempel (13) and Menahem Kister, (14) and to a recent paper of and conversation with Matthew Monger. (15)

(7) DJD 13:2.

(8) Ibid.

(9) In this volume, n. 6.

(10) Cf. in a glance, DJD 39:294-95.

(11) E.g., Todd Hanneken, "The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses" (Ph.D. diss. Notre Dame, 2008), 122.

(12) In spite of Hanneken, "The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses," 123, who simply states that there is no manuscript evidence for any of the theories of redaction or insertion.

(13) Charlotte Hempel, "The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 179-96.

(14) Menahem Kister, "Newly-Identified Fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub. 23:21-23, 30-31," *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 529-36.

(15) Matthew Monger, working at the MF - Norwegian School of Theology on a PhD on the manuscript transmission of *Jubilees*, shared with me his paper "The

2. Dead Sea Scrolls *Jubilees* Manuscripts

VanderKam's reference to at least fourteen *Jubilees* manuscripts (16) is misleading, if this implies that all or most of those manuscripts contained the entire book of *Jubilees* (as known from the Ethiopic version). (17) The Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* is considerably longer than the book of Genesis (which in turn is larger than the book of Isaiah). While scrolls covering the entire book of Isaiah, like 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b, require a relatively small script with many lines per column (and a small distance between the lines), this clearly is not the case with most *Jubilees* fragments. A manuscript that meets both criteria is the papyrus manuscript 4Q223-224, with small letters and 54 lines per column. (18) While the preserved sections only cover *Jub.* 32-40 (or 41), this manuscript, if it had all of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, would have required 40-42 columns. (19) The small size of the letters of 1Q17, 1Q18, 2Q19, 2Q20, would also be compatible with a long scroll with all of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. With other manuscripts, one scroll for the entire book cannot be ruled out, but would have resulted in a scroll even larger than the large Isaiah scroll or the Cave 11 Temple Scroll. For example, 4Q219, reconstructed to have had 38 lines per column, would have required about 68 columns for the entire (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, resulting in a scroll of close to 9 meters. (20) The larger size of the letters of 4Q220 and 4Q222 virtually rules out that they represent

Transmission of *Jubilees*: Reevaluating the Textual Basis" which he presented at the Enoch Graduate Seminar, Montreal May 2014. We had a long discussion September 26, 2014 in Oslo where we shared ideas.

(16) VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*," 5-6.

(17) Reinhard Deichgräber, "Fragmente einer Jubiläen-Handschrift aus Höhle 3 von Qumran," *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 415-22, at 421 already raised the question whether some *Jubilees* manuscripts might have contained only specific parts of *Jubilees*. Cf. also Kister, "Newly-Identified Fragments," with regard to 4Q176 (see below section 5). To my knowledge, Monger ("it is difficult to assume that all the manuscripts normally listed as being 'copies of *Jubilees*' are fragments of complete works") was the first to apply to the *Jubilees* fragmentary manuscripts the insights from material reconstruction. See, within the Göttingen tradition, most recently, Eva Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmenhandschriften aus der Wüste Juda* (STDJ 109; Leiden: Brill, 2014), for example p. 7 on format.

(18) Independently, Matthew Monger and I had made similar calculations.

(19) Calculations based on one column of Hebrew text corresponding to about 1,250 words in Charles's translation. Charles's entire translation has 51,145 words. The width of a column being in 4Q223-224 section II just larger than 10 cm, a scroll of 40-42 columns would have been slightly more than 4 meters.

(20) Calculation based on number of words of *Jub.* 21:10 (starting in last line of col. I) to 22:1 (ending in last line of col. II). Width of column with margin taken to be 13 cm.

a scroll with the entire text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. In the case of 4Q216, with only seventeen lines per column, a scroll with the entire text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees* would have required, at least one hundred, but likely many more columns, something that should be ruled out. (21) Likewise, the large letters of 4Q217 indicate that this could not have been a manuscript with all of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*.

The existence of one or more fragments corresponding with the text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees* does therefore not necessarily indicate that the original manuscripts contained all of the text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. I propose various alternative possibilities. The first is, as also stated by Milik, that a Hebrew text corresponding to Ethiopic *Jubilees* was copied in two parts. (22) The middle of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* is in chapter 23, and one can imagine that a literary bisection of the text would conclude one half with Abraham's death in *Jub.* 23 and the concluding apocalypse in chapter 23, and begin the other half with the Isaac and Jacob stories that are found from *Jub.* 24 on. A division into two parts may also explain why so many fragments preserve the text of *Jub.* 21 to 27. Those fragments then would not remain from the middle of a scroll, but from the beginning or end of a scroll with one half of *Jubilees*. One may note that there is only one manuscript (4Q221) that has texts from both parts (but see section 5 below). Alternatively, it is possible, that some manuscripts only copied a section of *Jubilees*, such as Abraham's final admonitions (*Jub.* 21-22), or the apocalypse (*Jub.* 23:12-31). This could be the case if fragments suggest a short scroll because of the large writing, a column with few lines, or a usual format, for example.

The question of which manuscripts or fragments are referred to as *Jubilees* is also largely dependent on their textual relationship to the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. Illustrative is VanderKam's original criticism of Kister's identification of 4Q176 frag. 21 as corresponding with *Jub.* 23:30-31, because the "text would disagree with the Ethiopic," (23) whereas he later accepted this identification in spite of the disagreement.

(21) The translation of *Jub.* 1 prologue up to *Jub.* 2:24 (corresponding with 4Q216 cols. 1-7) is about 5 to 6% of the length of the entire translation of *Jubilees*.

(22) For a manuscript bisection of *Jubilees*, but without any details, cf. J. T. Milik, in "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 60 and in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 58. On the manuscript bisection of some Isaiah manuscripts, see George J. Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," in "As Those Who Were Taught": *The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. C. M. McGinnis and P. K. Tull; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 69-85, esp. 77-80.

(23) James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees Translated* (CSCO 511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), ix.

Similarly, VanderKam questioned the identification of 4Q217 frags. 1 and 2 with *Jub.* 1:29 “because most of the words in the Ethiopic text do not correspond with those in frg. 2 2,” even though he later concedes “that *Jub.* 1:29 has suffered some corruption in the course of transmission.” (24) The question is then to what extent the textual and literary form of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* is determinative for our identification of a Hebrew manuscript or fragment as belonging to *Jubilees*. The question is important, since a longer process of redaction or rewriting, would have led to different versions within the Hebrew transmission, while we do not know which stage of the transmission is reflected in the Ethiopic *Jubilees*.

3. The Manuscript Evidence of 4Q216 and Compositional Theories Relating to *Jubilees* 1

The manuscript remains of 4Q216 consists of fragments from two consecutive sheets, sewn together (see frag. 12), but written in two different scribal hands. The first sheet, with remains from the prologue up to *Jub.* 1:28 are written in a late Hasmonaean hand, dating to approximately the mid-first century B.C.E. The second sheet, with remains of *Jub.* 2:1-24, was written in a palaeographically older hand, dated, as stated above, by VanderKam to ca. 125-100 B.C.E., and by Milik “nearer to the mid-second century B.C.E.” (25) The editors explain this phenomenon as follows:

It is very likely that the outer sheet of the scroll became worn or damaged and had to be replaced. The affected columns were then recopied and the new sheet stitched to the older parts of the manuscript. Only the happy accident of finding fragments written in two scripts yet sewn together into one manuscript allows one to see that they belong to a single copy of the book, not two. (26)

The editors’ hypothesis of a repair sheet may have been based on 11Q19, the Temple Scroll, which indeed seems to have a repair or replacement sheet at its beginning. (27) The first, to my knowledge,

(24) DJD 13:25 and 27.

(25) DJD 13:2. But note that in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, 58, Milik dates *Jubilees* to “at the earliest about 128 to 125 B.C.”

(26) J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, “The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-70, at 246. See similarly, DJD 13:1.

(27) On the replacement of sheets, cf. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125. Another example suggested tentatively by John Strugnell and Daniel

to question the repair sheet hypothesis was Hempel who wondered whether “we may be witnessing the compositional growth of *Jubilees*,” (28) and who produced literary arguments for the compositional adding of chapter 1 before chapter 2, (29) but did not elaborate on this suggestion. Independently, Monger stated the same, but more explicitly: since the second sheet begins with *Jub.* 2:1, (30) that sheet could have been the first one of the original manuscripts before the material addition of the sheet with *Jub.* 1. (31) Do those observations support the compositional hypothesis proposed by Kister, that *Jub.* 1, alongside several other sections including the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23, was a redactional addition to an older version of *Jubilees*? (32)

All considerations must be based on the impossibility that the original 4Q216 (copied in the second century B.C.E.) contained the entire book of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, and on the possibility (but not certainty) that this original 4Q216 began with what is now *Jub.* 2:1. The most simple hypothesis is that 4Q216 was an excerpt from the book of *Jubilees*. The excerpt might have started with ch. 1, which then would have been replaced later by a repair sheet. Or the excerpt started with the present *Jub.* 2 because a scribe, who may have been writing for

Harrington is in 4Q418 (see discussion in DJD 34:225-26). I contest this in my *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 61-64.

(28) Hempel, “The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond,” 189.

(29) *Ibid.*, 190.

(30) The editors start their reconstruction of col. V with *Jub.* 2:1, and this assumption influences their placement of the other fragments in cols. IV to VI. According to this reconstruction the lost text of *Jub.* 1:29 would just fit in the bottom lines of col. IV. Yet, if one would shift all the fragments in cols. IV-VI one or two lines downwards, then the second sheet would not anymore start with *Jub.* 2:1 but with part of *Jub.* 1:29. (It would also create two extra lines for the “missing” *Jub.* 1:15-25, a large section of text which the editors place in the missing col. III.) Materially, the top of frag. 13 has preserved too little to determine whether it is the top margin. At best, a careful examination of damage patterns of frags. 12-17 with frag. 18 (which has a top and bottom margin) may give additional evidence. Also if one adopts the editors’ placement, then the exact beginning of *Jub.* 2:1 at the beginning of a sheet does not necessarily imply that it was the beginning of the original manuscript: the same scribe decided not to begin the sixth day at the bottom of col. VI, but left—according to the editors—two blank lines, and started this day at the beginning of a new column (col. VII). One other example of a new literary section starting on a new sheet can be found on 4Q256 col. IX.

(31) Monger, “The Transmission of Jubilees: Reevaluating the Textual Basis.”

(32) Menahem Kister, “Concerning the History of the Essenes—A Study of the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Damascus Document*,” *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1-18 [Hebrew]; cf. also Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

exercise, or for his own interest, had an interest in the creation story, or in the Sabbath. A few generations later, a scribe then added the chapter that had originally not been copied. Or, alternatively, the scribe's excerpt started with *Jub. 2:1*, because at the time of copying that section was still the beginning of his text. In that case, a later scribe decided to complement that scribal excerpt by adding the missing chapter. Or, even more speculatively, the original 4Q216 (of which only the text corresponding to *Jub. 2:1-24* remains) represents one of the sources that ultimately was incorporated in the book of *Jubilees*. In that case, the addition of the first sheet could have been a material part of the compositional process.

Such considerations and speculations on the basis of the materiality of the manuscript should be checked against the literary analysis of the text. Can one imagine the text of *Jub. 2:1-24* (inasmuch as evidenced in 4Q216) as the beginning of a literary work, or even as an independent separate unit? Certainly, the angelic dictation to Moses in what is now *Jub. 2:1* ("The angel of the presence said on God's order to Moses: 'Write all the words about the creation ...'" (33)) is somewhat unexpected as the beginning of a text, without an explicit narrative setting as the one that is provided in the present *Jub. 1*. Such a somewhat abrupt beginning would require the already existing idea of angelic intermediacy and dictation at Sinai, which subsequently would have been made explicit and elaborated in *Jub. 1*. Against the hypothesis that an original 4Q216 (without the present first sheet) was the material remains of a source of the book of *Jubilees*, one should point at the last preserved words of 4Q216, "this is the testimony and the first law." The phrase reflects one of the overall themes of *Jubilees*, and seems more difficult to explain as deriving from one of its sources.

4. The 4Q217 Fragments and *Jubilees 1*

The tag on PAM 43.261 with the 4Q217 fragments briefly describes the plate as "4Qm 126 (40) 2 mss pap ment Jub." Also the DJD edition ascribes those fragments to two papyrus manuscripts: eleven fragments belonging to 4Q217 (named 4QpapJubilees^{b?}), and four other ones to a different manuscript (even though they have been given the numbers 4Q217 12-15). (34) It is not clear whether, and if so why, frags. 12-15 were once associated with *Jubilees*. The tag stating "pap(yrus) ment(ioning) Jub(ilees)" clearly refers to 4Q217, which in frag. 2 reads "the divisions of the times for the law and for the,"

(33) In 4Q216 V 1 only a few of those words have been preserved.

(34) DJD 13:23.

identical to the reference to *Jubilees* in the prologue, and similar to the wording in *Jub.* 1:29. The DJD edition transcribes and comments on frags. 1 and 2 separately, but one can tentatively align them, as proposed by Milik, in the same lines of a column and read

1 ויק[ח ...] מחלקות העתים לתורה ול[... 2 השנים [...]] לכל ש[ני] העולם מן
הברי[אה ...] 3 החדשה [...]] וכל [הנ]ברא עד היום. [... 4 [...]]...
[... ביר]ושלם ה[...]] 5 [...]] ב את כל[... 6 [...]]... [...]]

1 and he (the angel of the presence?) too[k ...] the divisions of the times, for the law and for [...] 2 the years [...] for all the y[ears of] eternity, from the crea[ti]on [...] 3 the new [...] and all [that is] created until the day [...] 4 ... [...] in Jer]usalem [...] 5 [...] all [...] 6 [...] ... [...]

Most words of the broken text can be found in the same order in Eth. *Jub.* 1:29.

And the angel of the presence, who was going along in front of the Israelite camp, took the tablets (which told) of the divisions of the years from the time the law and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until] the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, until the time when the temple of the Lord will be created in Jerusalem on Mt. Zion. All the luminaries will be renewed for (the purposes of) healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth. (35)

Nonetheless, the texts do not entirely correspond, and some of the phrases like “the divisions of the times, for the law and for” and “all the years of eternity” find closer correspondences in the Prologue than in those of (Ethiopic) *Jub.* 1:29. The DJD edition struggled with the relation of these fragments to the Ethiopic *Jubilees*, and could only connect them if “some major textual changes [...] occurred between the Hebrew original and the Ethiopic translation (via a Greek intermediary).” (36) The DJD editors did not, however, consider the possibility of variant Hebrew wording or literary editions.

Materially, the few papyrus fragments with large writing and large spacing between the lines, rule out the possibility that 4Q217 was a manuscript that included the entire *Jubilees*. At best it may have contained a

(35) Translations of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* generally are adopted from VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees Translated*.

(36) DJD 13:25.

small portion. The “scribal hand ... in the cursive sequence” (37) would also be unexpected for a formal copy. Such writing is more common for documents, personal copies or for notes. The text of the two fragments of 4Q217 can most easily be interpreted as a variant and shorter wording of *Jub.* 1:29. For example, 4Q217 frags. 1-2 line 3 כל [הנ]ברא עד היום suggests a text much shorter than the corresponding Ethiopic “*the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, until the time.*” One may suppose that 4Q217 is a shortening of a longer text that is behind the Ethiopic, perhaps by parablepsis from the first “all the(ir) creatures” to the second “all the creatures.” Or, alternatively, the Ethiopic text reflects an expansion. Thus, the final clause of *Eth. Jub.* 1:29, “All the luminaries will be renewed for healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth,” with the unique reference to the “elect ones of Israel” and the sudden reference to healing (a motif that returns in 23:29-30), could very well be an addition to the text. Whether that clause was a *Fortschreibung* of the text, commenting on the preceding renewal of the “powers of the sky,” or whether the expansion of the last part triggered the simultaneous or subsequent insertion of the “powers of the sky” cannot be determined. In either case, the hypothesis that this final clause of *Eth. Jub.* 1:29 represents a later stage of the text strengthens Milik’s proposal that the few letters of line 6 would correspond to *Jub.* 1:2 כתוב את כל דברי.

The other short fragments are not very helpful in determining the nature of the manuscript, and at best the few remaining but damaged and isolated words may also be associated with the text of *Jubilees*. Though 4Q217 frags. 1-2 attest to a variant text of *Jub.* 1:29, one can only hypothesize about the nature of 4Q217. We can observe that in *Eth. Jubilees*, the prologue and 1:26, 27-28, and 29 present four textually related but different formulations of the contents of what follows in the book. Such differences may be due to literary variation, or to the translation from the Hebrew through the Greek to the Ethiopic, or even in the Ethiopic transmission. The 4Q217 evidence suggests that some of the variations may be due to the internal growth or the redaction of the Hebrew text. Minimally, these fragments witness to rewriting or *Fortschreibung* of the Hebrew *Jubilees* text up to the first century B.C.E.

The clues of 4Q216 (possible mid-first century B.C.E. addition of *Jub.* 1 to a manuscript containing *Jub.* 2) and 4Q217 (apparently

a different form of *Jub.* 1:29 attested in the early to mid-first century B.C.E. (38)) may be combined. 4Q217, a short, cursively written papyrus manuscript is our first, admittedly very fragmentary, material witness to the connection of *Jub.* 1 and 2. Given its cursive character and differing form, one may even muse whether this manuscript was one of the drafts made by those scribes who eventually redacted the book of *Jubilees*. Of course, this is far-fetched, but a consideration of some possible arguments against this conjecture, namely incongruence of date and place, is helpful to shed light on our preconceptions.

First, the hypothesis of rewriting or *Fortschreibung* of *Jubilees* in the first century B.C.E. is entirely feasible in light of the many minor and major textual and literary variants we witness in first-century B.C.E. manuscripts from Qumran, non-biblical as well as biblical texts (e.g., the *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts). However, it is incongruent with scholarly practice, which by and large takes the Eth. *Jubilees* text as witness to the assumed second-century B.C.E. form of its text. The hypothesis of an early to mid-first century B.C.E. redactional addition of ch. 1 (and some other sections like ch. 23) brings us even later than Kister's late second-century dating of those chapters, and requires a reconsideration of its possible literary and theological relationships to other Dead Sea scrolls compositions.

Second, the hypothesis that Qumran Cave 4 would have contained a draft made by the scribes who wrote or edited new parts of *Jubilees*, is at odds with the theory of Cave 4 as the library or text depository of a secluded sectarian community. That theory would then lead one to conclude that our present version of *Jubilees* was a product of that specific community. While none of the alternative theories for the relation between the scrolls and the settlement has been broadly accepted, they do serve as a reminder to allow for different historical scenarios, which would allow for a *Jubilees* draft in Qumran Cave 4.

5. *Jubilees* 23 in the Hebrew Manuscripts

If *Jub.* 1 may have a later redactional addition, then we should also look at the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23:9-32 (or 23:12-31) which may have belonged to the same redactional layer. (39) Four different

(38) The palaeographical dating of 4Q217 in DJD 13:23 is problematic, and characteristic for the dating by most DJD editors. The forms of the letters are compared with several samples presented and dated by Frank Cross, and the proposed palaeographical date is the mean of the dates of Cross's samples.

(39) E.g., Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 321. Note that the apocalypse is integrated in the text, and that one cannot simply detach a number of verses as an originally independent unit.

Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts preserve fragments covering parts of *Jub.* 23, namely 2Q19, 3Q5, 4Q176 frags. 19-21, and 4Q221.

2Q19 consists of a single fragment written in an Herodian hand, with remnants of *Jub.* 23:7-8, and ending with the words “old and full of days.” After that the next line is uninscribed. The editor interpreted the unwritten area at the bottom of the fragment as a possible bottom margin. (40) Alternatively, this unwritten area might also have been an entire empty line, separating 23:8 from the new section 23:9ff. Or perhaps this text simply broke off with the end of the life of Abraham.

Baillet published seven fragments, written in a first-century C.E. hand, as 3Q5, of which some were subsequently identified as *Jubilees* fragments. Fragments 1, 3, and 4 can be identified with certainty as corresponding to *Jub.* 23:12-13, 6-7, and 10, (41) respectively, and frag. 2 perhaps with *Jub.* 23:23. (42) Thus, 3Q5 contained both the section preceding the apocalypse and the apocalypse proper. The relatively large size of the letters makes it unlikely that the scroll contained all of *Jubilees*. The fragments might derive from a scroll ending with *Jub.* 23.

More problematic are the other two, older manuscripts (4Q176 19-21 and 4Q221) and the relation between the two. In DJD 5, John Allegro published in 1968 fifty-seven fragments as part of 4Q176 (4Q*Tanhûmîm*). John Strugnell has already remarked that frags. 19-21 were materially very much the same, (43) and later Kister identified three of those fragments (19-21) as corresponding to the text of *Jub.* 23:21-23, 30-31. (44) He interpreted the fragments as deriving from two consecutive columns, since the textual reconstruction of the lines of frags. 19-20 renders a very broad column (of 13, 12, and 15 words in lines 2-4), while the reconstruction of frag. 21 results in a very narrow column of only five words in a line. The straight vertical left side of frag. 20 might join neatly to the straight vertical right side of frag. 21, (45) although it would result in a very narrow intercolumnar margin of 0.6-1.0 cm.

(40) Maurice Baillet in DJD 3:78: “marge inférieure?”

(41) Maurice Baillet, “Remarques sur le manuscrit du livre des Jubilés de la Grotte 3 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 423-33 at 428-29 identified the correspondence of frag. 4 with *Jub.* 23:10, but read mistakenly מַן הָרִשִׁי (in frag. 4 line 2. Instead, the second word should be read הָרִשִׁי. For the Hebrew plural corresponding to singular *ʾakay* in the Ethiopic, see also 4Q221 5 3 (*Jub.* 37:13). I therefore do not agree with the dismissal of the identification by VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 100-101.

(42) For the identification of frag. 2 see most recently Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings Volume 2* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi, 2013), 233, though I am skeptical about the reading of וְכֹל at the end of line 2.

(43) John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163-276 at 235.

(44) Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments.”

(45) Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 235.

Kister touches upon the nature of the manuscript 4Q176 19-21, and considered four alternatives: (46) (1) the fragments belonged to a manuscript of the whole Book of *Jubilees*; (2) the manuscript contained only the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23 excerpted from the book of *Jubilees*; (3) the manuscript contained the apocalypse, but as an independent unit reflecting the text before it was taken up in *Jubilees*; and (4) the fragments belonged to another text (like the *Tanḥûmîm*) which contained quotations from sacred scripture and from *Jubilees*. Kister does not explicitly choose, but one may guess that because of the narrow second column, typical for last columns of a scroll, and the blank line (bottom margin?) after *Jub.* 23:31, he favoured the option that the manuscript contained only the apocalypse.

But do 4Q176 19-21 belong together? In a postscript Kister refers to the observation of Émile Puech that the scribal hand of frag. 21 is similar to that of 4QJub^f (4Q221). Indeed, the edition of 4Q221 mentions that “4Q176 21, now recognized to be from another manuscript of *Jubilees*, was copied by the scribe of 4Q221.” (47) Milik described the hand of 4Q176 frags. 19-20 as “a semi-formal hand, clumsy and inexperienced” and the scribal hand of 4Q176 frag. 21 as “a semi-cursive hand of a professional ... precisely the hand of the scribe who copied 4QJub^f.” (48) It is not clear what Milik believed, (49) but VanderKam (who had earlier criticized Kister’s identification of frag. 21) maintained the distinction between 4Q176 19-21 and 4Q221, (50) without considering the possibility that 4Q176 21 should be reassigned to 4Q221, resulting in two different *Jubilees* manuscripts, recognizable by two different hands.

With regard to material appearance, 4Q176 frags. 19-21 are clearly distinct from the other 4Q176 fragments. While most of the 4Q176 (*4QTanḥûmîm*) fragments are lighter and tobacco-coloured, frags. 19-21 are darker and have a reddish tone. (51) Most of the 4Q221 fragments

(46) Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments,” 535.

(47) DJD 13:64.

(48) J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, “4QJub^f (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” *HAR* 14 (1994): 233-61 at 233.

(49) VanderKam and Milik, “4QJub^f (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” 233 n. 1, announces Milik’s forthcoming article, “A propos de 4Q176 19-21 (*Jub* 23),” which, however, was never published.

(50) The choice of words in “4QJub^f (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” 233, “Milik believes that it is necessary to distinguish two hands in Kister’s fragments” betray his reluctance to follow Milik.

(51) Clearly, 4Q176 19-21 were not associated with the 4Q176 fragments on the basis of the skin, but on the general semi-cursive correspondence of the hand of 4Q176 20 with that of some other 4Q176 fragments. Thus, on PAM 41.309 frag. 20 is on the same plate as frags. 16, 18, 22, 30 (and some other smaller 4Q176 fragments). On PAM 41.813 frags. 19-21 are (together with 4Q425 frag. 6) on the top left section

are lighter, but frag. 5 is dark, similar to 4Q176 19-21. The appearance of the skin of 4Q176 frag. 21 is different from both 4Q176 19-20 and 4Q221, possibly because of the process of gelatinization of the skin. The straight edges of 4Q176 20 and 21 might fit, but would result in an uncharacteristically short margin between the writing. Altogether, I am strongly inclined to follow the evidence of the scribal hand, and reassign 4Q176 21 to 4Q221. What can we then say about *Jub.* 23 in both manuscripts?

The manuscript 4Q176 frags. 19-20 consists of two fragments with the text of *Jub.* 23:21-23. The left edge of frag. 20 could be the straight left end of a sheet. Given the reconstructed width of the lines one can imagine, for example, a two-column sheet of 22-23 lines or more, that could have contained the apocalypse. However, one can also envisage a larger manuscript, containing a more extensive part of *Jubilees*, and perhaps ending with ch. 23. The size of the letters, and the space in between the lines would seem to rule out that these fragments belonged to a manuscript of the whole book of *Jubilees*.

The fragments published as 4Q221 attest to *Jub.* 21-23 (frags. 1-3), to *Jub.* 33 (frag. 4), and to *Jub.* 37-39 (frags. 5-7). Twelve more fragments have not been identified, and according to the DJD edition three of those may not belong to the manuscript. 4Q221 frag. 3 preserves the left end of six lines that correspond to *Jub.* 23:10-13. The height of the columns in 4Q221 is not known, but 4Q176 frag. 21 would have derived some columns to the left (two or three columns?) of frag. 3. The narrow reconstructed column of 4Q176 frag. 21 suggests it came from the end of a sheet, and possibly from the end of a manuscript. Thus, it would be possible that the fragments of 4Q221 actually derive from two different manuscripts, one ending with *Jub.* 23, and the other beginning with *Jub.* 24. But then the unwritten space at the bottom of 4Q176 frag. 21 is conspicuous, since it suggests the possibility that *Jub.* 23:32 was not included in the column, and hence not in the manuscript.

The manuscript evidence, all later than the middle of the first century B.C.E., does not offer much conclusive evidence. 3Q5 and 4Q221 attest to the apocalypse being part of the book of *Jubilees*. 4Q176 19-20 could have derived from a sheet only containing some form of the apocalypse, but this is only one of several options. Likewise, one cannot say anything conclusive about 2Q19. This means that the

of the plate, and several 4Q176 fragments on the bottom. Important is the tab, which states: "4Q misc s/curs 22 JMA," thus clearly indicating that the semi-cursive script was the criterion for putting those fragments on one and the same plate (and later for assigning them to one manuscript).

possibility that ch. 23 or the apocalypse could have formed a separate unit cannot be clearly supported by the manuscript evidence. Indeed, given the later dates of the manuscripts, this would not be expected.

However, the manuscript evidence does support the idea of a scribal bisection of *Jubilees*, and perhaps the late date of the redaction that added *Jub.* 23:32 as a conclusion to ch. 23, or perhaps even to the first half of the book.

6. Summary

The approach of this essay has been to look afresh at some of the manuscript evidence of the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts, in relation to the theories of the composition of *Jubilees*. Most of the manuscripts are too fragmentary and too young to yield any new insights. However, the joint evidence of the older manuscripts 4Q216 and 4Q217 does support the hypothesis of a late addition of *Jub.* 1. There is inconclusive manuscript evidence for the different hypotheses about the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23, except for the likelihood that it served as the ending of the first scroll of a scribal bisection of *Jubilees*. On a much smaller level, the apparent absence of the end of *Jub.* 1:29 in 4Q217, and of *Jub.* 23:32 in 4Q221 suggests an ongoing *Fortschreibung* or rewriting of *Jubilees*, rather than the work of one final author, redactor, or interpolator responsible for a final version.

APPENDIX:

AN UNPUBLISHED FRAGMENT FORMERLY REFERRED TO AS 4Q221 FRAG. 20

Museum Plate #363 contains all the 4Q221 fragments (both the identified frags. 1-7 and the unidentified frags. 8-19), as well as one other fragment (frag. 20) that the editors no longer considered part of 4Q221. (52) This fragment was also included with 4Q221 on PAM 43.188, and (only its upper part) on PAM 42.223. To my knowledge, this fragment has not been published anywhere else. The fragment is written in the same style as 4Q221, but the hand is executed with more attention. On the basis of the new IAA photographs, (53) one can transcribe this fragment as follows.

(52) VanderKam and Milik, "4QJub^f (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition," 233: "[frg. 20 is no longer considered part of 4Q221]".

(53) <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-361320> and B-361321.

- 1 [לְבִי]
 2]תּוֹרוֹת[
 3]אִסְפָּרָה[
 4]הֵל בְּתוֹךְ[
 5]עֲלִיּוֹן וְאִבְרָכָה]
 bottom margin

In line 4 one can read קָהֶל, and the larger spaces between the words in lines 4 and 5 suggest poetry or even stichometric writing. The text does not seem to match that of any other text, but the connection of the words in lines 3-4 is also found in Ps 22:23: אִסְפָּרָה שְׁמִי לְאָחִי בְּתוֹךְ קָהֶל אֲהַלֵּלָהּ:

Eibert J.C. TIGCHELAAR

4Q216 AND THE STATE OF *JUBILEES* AT QUMRAN

Summary

This essay presents a preliminary analysis of 4Q216 from the perspective of material philology, and comments on the implications of reading the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments from a material perspective. By taking seriously the materiality of the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts, it is argued that there were likely not 14 complete manuscripts of *Jubilees* at Qumran. In addition, this analysis calls into question the commonly held view that there is a high level of literary and textual stability connecting the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran to Ethiopic manuscripts dating from the late fourteenth century C.E. and later. In light of the material composition of 4Q216, it is suggested that the manuscript may show evidence of the literary development of *Jubilees* during the Qumran period. In addition, a number of variants between the 4Q216 and Ethiopic *Jubilees* point toward the development of diverging trajectories within the *Jubilees* tradition post-Qumran.

INTRODUCTION

THIS essay presents a preliminary discussion (1) of the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments from the perspective of material philology. (2) The textual history of *Jubilees* is in many ways still full of

(1) This is a part of my ongoing PhD research project on the transmission and transformation of *Jubilees* in the different manuscript cultures where it is found.

(2) This essay builds upon a section of my paper “The Transmission of *Jubilees*: Reevaluating the Textual Basis,” presented at the *Enoch Graduate Seminar* in Montreal, May 2014 and at the annual *Old Testament Studies, Epistemologies and Methodologies* meeting in Hamburg, September 2014. I am grateful for all feedback I received there, and especially for the input I have had from Liv Ingeborg Lied, Martin Hallaschka, Reinhard Kratz, Kipp Davis and Eibert Tigchelaar. I am also grateful to Eibert Tigchelaar for sharing with me his essay, “The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book” (in this issue).

lacunae, much like many other ancient works. The gap in time between the oldest extant manuscript of *maṣṣāfa kufāle*, the Ethiopic name for the work known in English as *Jubilees*, and the proposed writing or redaction of the work is more than 1400 years. The discovery of fragments corresponding to sections of *Jubilees* at Qumran has confirmed that there indeed were texts similar to Ethiopic *Jubilees* in existence in the last centuries B.C.E. In recent scholarly works on *Jubilees*, it seems that a consensus has been reached as to the state of the text, as transmitted from Hebrew, through Greek, to Ethiopic. The predictions of scholars such as Robert H. Charles (3) and others concerning the dating and history of the text of *Jubilees* have been at least partially confirmed with the identification of the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments. Following the work of James VanderKam, (4) most scholars accept that despite the great distance in time, language, and geography between the Qumran fragments and the oldest complete manuscript of *maṣṣāfa kufāle*, the text of *Jubilees* is “in surprisingly good shape.” (5)

Based on the DJD edition, which continues and expands the work begun in VanderKam’s *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, there is generally very little discussion of the textual history of *Jubilees* in recent scholarship. Some scholars make use of the Qumran material in their discussions, (6) but do not address questions related to the state of the rest of the text not evidenced at Qumran, or what the variant readings may mean for the understanding of the composition as a whole.

In recent years, a growing number of scholars in a variety of fields have begun to evaluate manuscripts not only as witnesses to a text, which can be assessed and valued according to their importance

(3) See Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), xiii who says that “[t]he book of Jubilees was written in Hebrew... between the year...135 and 105 B.C.”

(4) James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977); VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 3-21.

(5) VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees,” 21. The full extent of this optimism can be seen in the presentation in DJD 13, where Qumran fragments are heavily supplemented by a retroversion of the Ethiopic to Hebrew. Note 1 on page 5 in DJD 13 reads “The Hebrew reconstructions in this edition merely retrovert the Ethiopic into Hebrew and are therefore tentative.” VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VII, Parabiblical Texts, Part I* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1-185.

(6) See Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007); James L. Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

as witnesses to an early, first-hand or original text, but also as artifacts that reflect the context where they were produced. (7) While the methods of collecting and comparing manuscripts and textual variants is not vastly different from the *recensio* of classical textual criticism, the traditional goal of reconstructing a more pristine or earlier text, i.e. choosing better readings, is not shared. (8) By analyzing the different texts actually found on the pages of the manuscripts as snapshots of a developing text, it seems that *Jubilees* is not a frozen text, but is an evolving tradition. Ethiopic *Jubilees* represents one of the trajectories of this evolving tradition, and there are clear similarities between it and the Hebrew manuscripts found at Qumran. However, the result of 1400 years of the development of the Ethiopic trajectory should not define the presentation and evaluation of the Qumran material. The scholarly conception of what *Jubilees* is greatly impacts how we have come to understand the *Jubilees* material at Qumran. Without the

(7) Annette Steudel has worked extensively with material reconstructions of Qumran manuscripts for several decades, e.g., Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschar^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1993). More recently, see also George J. Brooke, "Scripture and Scriptural Tradition in Transmission: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki* (ed. George J. Brooke et al.; STDJ 103; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 1-17; Daniel K. Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran," in *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity* (ed. Clemens Leonhard and Hermut Löhr; WUNT 2.363; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 33-87; Kipp Davis, "The Social Milieu of 4QJer^a (4Q70) in a Second Temple Jewish Manuscript Culture: Fragments, Manuscripts, Variance, and Meaning" (forthcoming); Davis, "There and Back Again: Reconstruction and Reconciliation in the War Texts of 4QMilhamah^a (4Q246^{a-c})," in *The War Scroll, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (ed. Kipp Davis et al.; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); Mika Pajunen, *Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381* (JAJS 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

(8) Working in New Testament textual criticism, David Parker claims that "We can use philology to reconstruct an Initial Text." David C. Parker, *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament: The Lyell Lectures, Oxford, Trinity Term 2011* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 29. Similarly, Paul Wegner, in an article on the current state of Old Testament textual criticism claims six possible goals for this field: to restore 1) the original composition, 2) the final form of the text, 3) the earliest attested form, 4) accepted texts (plural), 5) final texts (plural), and 6) all various "literary editions" of the Old Testament. See Paul D. Wegner, "Current trends in Old Testament Textual Criticism," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23 (2013): 461-80. See also Gary D. Martin, *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism* (TCS 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010). The most recent edition of Emanuel Tov's textbook on textual criticism takes seriously the interplay between literary and textual criticism, but still aims at reconstructing an earlier original or determinative text, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d ed.; Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 2012), 1, 2, 281-326.

presumption that all differences in readings between the Hebrew and the Ethiopic are corruptions of the text, reading the Qumran fragments as texts in their own right will give a greater understanding of the developing and diverging *Jubilees* trajectories. Thus, the goal of my approach here is not to emend later texts with a more original reading, nor reconstruct a text prior to the Qumran fragments. My aim here is to discuss and explore the shape of *Jubilees* as we find it in its material context in these fragments, taking into account not only the philological discussion of words and variants, but also questions about what a material reconstruction of the manuscript says about its function. (9)

In the following, I will briefly discuss the current scholarly consensus on the state of the text of *Jubilees*, and the broad lines of what the materiality of the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments might say about the number and size of *Jubilees* manuscripts at Qumran. To illustrate how the methodological considerations discussed above may impact our understanding of *Jubilees*, I will present a preliminary material philological discussion of 4Q216, likely the oldest of the *Jubilees* manuscripts found at Qumran.

Before moving on to a discussion of *Jubilees*, it may be helpful to clarify some terminological issues. In an attempt to distinguish between the different ways in which sources are used in the discourse surrounding ancient and modern texts it is fruitful to distinguish between some key terms. In general, we can distinguish between manuscripts, texts, works. (10) The distinction is important as the outcome of research will be impacted by the conception of which level we are working on. In this essay I understand these terms in the following ways: (11)

(9) This approach has been variously termed New Philology and Material Philology. These terms may be misleading as it does not claim entirely new methods, nor ignore the use of material reconstruction in traditional philology, but focuses on the material context and reception of a text in a given manuscript as the object of study, not a previous or different form of the text. See for example M. J. Driscoll, "Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New," in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (ed. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge; Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010), 85-102; Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris: Seuil, 1989).

(10) As far as I know, these terms were first introduced into the study of the Pseudepigrapha in Liv Ingeborg Lied, "Textual Transmission and Liturgical Transformation of 2 Baruch in Syriac Monasticism" (paper presented at *The Rest is Commentary: New Work on Ancient Jewish Texts*. Yale University, 28 April 2013).

(11) Following Liv Ingeborg Lied, "Text—Work—Manuscript: What is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon," in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* (forthcoming, 2015), 2. See also Driscoll, "Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New." Parker uses a similar distinction, but uses the term "document" where

- Manuscript: A physical artifact, produced at a certain place at a certain point in time. A hand-written document that may contain several texts.
- Text: The actual words of a piece of writing, what is physically present on the page.
- Work: The *conception* of a composition as a coherent unit. (12)

JUBILEES AT QUMRAN

The importance of such terminological distinctions as discussed above becomes apparent in the description of the evidence for *Jubilees* at Qumran as it is presented in scholarship. The following initial discussion will highlight the need for distinguishing between manuscripts, texts, and works.

The Qumran manuscripts (13) contain the earliest extant texts that can be related to *Jubilees*. The manuscripts presumably date from the last quarter of the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. In his most recent discussion of *Jubilees*, VanderKam lists 14 manuscripts found at Qumran and calls this a “goodly number of copies of *Jubilees*, all written in Hebrew....” (14) To this list he adds 4 possible copies “about which some skepticism is in order.” (15) The language here suggests the assumption that where there is a fragment of a manuscript, there is a copy of the work. In addition to this, it seems that in DJD 13, where the *Jubilees* Cave 4 fragments are discussed, the direction of the comparisons moves from the text of Ethiopic *Jubilees* to the fragmentary Qumran evidence. For example, in the discussion of the text of 4Q221 in comparison with *Jub.* 39:8-9 VanderKam and Milik state that “[i]f the fragment has been identified correctly,

I follow Lied’s “manuscript.” See Parker, *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament*, 10-31. For a similar discussion within Qumran studies, see Eibert Tigchelaar, “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman),” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 26-47.

(12) This is formulated in the following way Lied: “As I see it, a “work” is a *conceived* compositional unit.... The concept of a “work” is both a representation and an abstraction, and is not to be confused with “the text”: it is a way a text is *represented*.” Lied, “Text—Work—Manuscript: What is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon,” 2.

(13) After the *editio princeps* in DJD 13 the manuscripts are discussed in various settings, see for example Peter W. Flint, “Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint and Tae Hun Kim; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 80-126.

(14) VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*,” 4-8.

(15) *Ibid.*, 6.

a major problem arises in connexion with both extant words in line 10...neither word corresponds with anything in the Ethiopic or Latin texts.” (16)

These underlying assumptions about the existence of a work and its shape influence the presentation of the material in the edition. There are difficulties in dealing with the materiality of the scrolls, i.e. their size, physical properties and fragmentary state, so that it is sometimes not clear whether we are dealing with texts from complete manuscripts of the work called *Jubilees*, or if we are dealing with smaller sections or even completely different works. The scrolls also vary greatly in size and style, implying that not all of the manuscripts may have been likely to contain the entire text of *Jubilees*. In fact, it is difficult to assume that all the manuscripts normally listed as being “copies of *Jubilees*” (17) are fragments of complete works. It is likely that several of these fragments belonged to shorter texts, or to other versions of *Jubilees* than the work known from the Ethiopic tradition. Eight of the manuscripts listed in VanderKam 2009 retain words from less than 10 verses from *Jubilees* and of the more complete texts, the size of the sheets and writing varies greatly. (18) If VanderKam and Milik’s reconstruction of 4Q223-224 as having 54 lines per column is correct, (19) then it alone of the Cave 4 *Jubilees* manuscripts, could reasonably have been a manuscript containing a text as long as the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. (20)

At the textual level, a closer reading of the Qumran evidence may present more difficulties than the editions seem to identify. In fact, the *Jubilees* fragments contain only a very small amount of text compared with the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. In a highly critical review of the DJD edition, Edward Ullendorff notes that “we possess at most 2.5% of Hebrew words preserved in widely scattered and highly fragmentary bits.” (21) Ullendorff, however, did not spell out the consequences of this observation. By paying more attention to the materiality of the fragments, new and interesting information can be gleaned, and many

(16) VanderKam and Milik, “*Jubilees*,” 82.

(17) See for example VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*,” 4.

(18) In addition to this is another glaring problem: fragments of *Jubilees* that are very close to the Biblical narrative may be misinterpreted as being biblical manuscripts.

(19) This reconstruction is also based on a retroversion of the Ethiopic, and thus difficult to verify. There are no complete columns among the fragments. In addition, it is worth noting that 4Q223-224 is written on papyrus and would be one of the largest Qumran scrolls, regardless of material, and by far the largest of the papyri, making this reconstruction even more uncertain.

(20) See Tigchelaar, “The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book,” who independently has drawn the same conclusion.

(21) Edward Ullendorff, “Dead Sea Texts and Lacunae,” *JJS* 47 (1996): 323-36.

assumptions about the state of the text must be revisited. In fact, it may be that there was a much lower level of literary and textual stability in *Jubilees* at this stage than has previously been suggested.

A relevant related issue is the fact that *Jubilees* not only exists at Qumran in the form that is known to us from the latter Ethiopic sources, but there are also three manuscripts, labeled 4Q225-227, that have been called *Pseudo-Jubilees*. (22) The texts of these manuscripts show clear parallels with that of *Jubilees*, most notably employing language relating to weeks of years and jubilees, for example in 4Q226 frg. 1 lines 5-6:

5 י שנים עשית מִן הַשָּׁבוּעַ
6 הַיּוֹבֵל הַזֶּה כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הוּא

...years you did from the week...
...this jubilee, for it is holy...

Another method used to identify texts related to *Jubilees* is through common themes, such as the mention of *Mastemah* in connection with the *Aqedah*. The telling of the *Aqedah* framed in a Job-like narrative (23) where *Mastemah* plays a role is well known from *Jub.* 17:15-18:15. This is reflected in the text of 4Q225, which is a version of the *Aqedah*, where *Mastemah* is mentioned in frg. 2 column ii line 14: (24)

שֶׁר הֵמ[ש]טְמָה וַיִּשְׁמַע בְּלִיעֵל

the prince (of the) Mastemah, and Belial listened

These details merely serve to confirm the parallel seen when reading the fragments as a whole, that the contents of the so-called *Pseudo-Jubilees* texts are very close to *Jubilees*. At the very least they represent an example of the variant lines of development of the text of *Jubilees*.

These examples may suggest that *Jubilees* is not necessarily just a singular work. It may be a composite cluster, found in different forms in different contexts and manuscripts. It may be more fitting to speak of *Jubilees* within a continuum or tradition of texts that use a common

(22) VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 141-175. There is also one text from Masada that is labeled as Pseudo Jubilees, see Shemaryahu Talmon, *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965 Final Reports* (ed. Joseph Aviram, Gideon Foerster, and Ehud Netzer; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 117-19.

(23) This tradition is also known from other sources, e.g. *b. Sanh.* 89b. and *Midr. Ber. Rab.* 55.4. See also Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (2d ed.; ed. Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 224-25

(24) See VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 149-151.

framework, including linguistic and cultural elements. The difficulty is that few of these texts have survived in whole, only where happenstance has preserved the right lines of a text are we able to identify the close ties between the texts. In the remainder of this essay I will attempt to illustrate how a material reading of the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments gives fresh insights into the textual and literary development of *Jubilees* by focusing on a material analysis of 4Q216.

4Q216

The remnants of 4Q216 are made up of 18 fragments, which vary greatly in size and condition. The manuscript is quite fragmentary, and large portions of the corresponding section from Ethiopic *Jubilees* cannot be reconstructed based on the Hebrew text of 4Q216. Nonetheless, the fragments can be arranged in relation to the order of the Ethiopic text. The scroll itself is relatively small in size. If VanderKam and Milik are correct in asserting that fragment 18 retains text from all lines of column VII, then a reconstruction of the height would be approximately 14.5 cm (25) with 17 lines of text per column. (26) The length cannot be reconstructed from the remaining fragments, but portions of 6 columns are retained. According to VanderKam and Milik's reconstruction, the fragments can be placed relative to each other according to the Ethiopic text, yielding a first sheet, containing columns I-IV, (27) with fewer letters per line than sheet two. (28) The first two columns of the first sheet are very reconstructed as similar in size, averaging 44.7 and 44.8 letters per line, (29) respectively. Column III is completely lacking and is not reconstructed in the edition, where the space between Col. II and IV is filled with the following information:

(25) *Ibid.*, 1.

(26) With only 17 lines of text per column, 4Q216 is quite small and would require far too many sheets to contain a complete manuscript. This can be compared with 1QIsa^a, one of the largest scrolls found at Qumran, which is 28 cm high with 32 lines per column. This is in line with other findings from other manuscripts from Qumran, see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

(27) In this analysis, I am using the established column numbers as found in VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 1-22, though I will argue below that the column numbers also must be discussed as they assume a reconstruction for which there is no material evidence.

(28) See VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 1.

(29) The letter counts according to VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 1 are based on the reconstruction from the Ethiopic and thus are only meant as an illustration here.

“[Col. III *Jub.* 1:15-25, missing].” (30) This suggests that it might be somewhat problematic that the text is assumed based on the reconstruction of the Ethiopic, without other material cause. In addition, it is not clear that the entire text of *Jub.* 1:15-25 would fit into the available space without significant variants or rearrangement of the other fragments. (31) Column IV, the final column on the sheet is reconstructed with shorter lines, averaging at 35.1 letters per line.

The second sheet is reconstructed as having longer lines; column V averages 49.2 letters per line, column VI averages 50.4 and column VII averages 57.6. It seems plausible that the length of the lines of the last column on sheet two also reflects the fact that it was at the end of a sheet, and therefore was stretched to fill the space. That is to say that, despite many variants and lacunae, the text can be reasonably reconstructed as having filled two sheets. The state of the manuscript is quite poor, with no complete lines being retained. There are many lacunae, though where there is extant text VanderKam and Milik have found possible parallels in the Ethiopic text.

A very interesting feature of 4Q216 is the fact that there is visible stitching between columns IV and V, clearly connecting not only the columns but also two separate sheets, written in different hands. The stitching is in a straight line vertically and indicates that there was a clean break at this point. The sheet of parchment containing columns I-IV is copied by a different hand and is dated to the mid-first century B.C.E.—somewhat younger than the attached sheet, containing 3 columns (V-VII), which is dated to 125 – 100 B.C.E. (32) It is clear that we have a single manuscript that connects two different sheets of parchment, which were copied at different times. VanderKam and Milik theorize that the outer sheet of the scroll was damaged, possibly due to wear, and was replaced, the original first sheet being recopied. (33) While this is a plausible explanation, it may be that this was not a replacement sheet at all. The fact that the two were stitched together at some point before the abandonment of the scrolls at Qumran is clear, but it is not discernible whether the first sheet is meant to be a replacement of a ruined part of the original, an addition written

(30) VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 11.

(31) Based on my comparison of VanderKam’s critical Ethiopic text and DJD 13, it seems that Ethiopic text would fill 15-20% more space than is available. Allowing for the realignment of the fragments would possibly make room for the text, but would cause other problems in the positioning of the Hebrew text in relation to the Ethiopic.

(32) VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 2.

(33) Ibid., 1. See also James C. VanderKam, “The First *Jubilees* Manuscript From Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-70.

at the time of attachment, or the combination of two existing manuscripts to create a (new) continuous text. When viewed in light of the materiality of the find, the theory embracing the new sheet as a replacement of a part of the original is *a priori* no less likely than the other options. (34)

There is limited evidence of the replacement of first sheets at Qumran. According to Tov, (35) 4Q216 is one of only three manuscripts that clearly retain a *first* sheet stitched to one or more sheets, the two other instances being 4Q41 (36) (4QDeuteronomyⁿ) and 11Q19 (37) (11QTemple^a). These, however, warrant further examination here.

Concerning 11Q19, Yadin (38) speculates that the scroll was originally copied by a scribe, who completed the entire work. Over the course of time the first sheet, containing the first 5 columns became worn, and a second scribe recopied it on a new piece of parchment. Other than the obvious change in parchment and handwriting, the relationship between the two sheets is further strengthened by the fact that there is overlap in content. The last few lines of column V are repeated at the top of column VI. Yadin interprets this to mean that the scribe did not want to leave open space between the columns and continued the text to the bottom of the column. Further evidence in support of the replacement of the first sheet in 11Q19 is the fact that there are noticeable patches and reinforcements in the manuscript, (e.g. Col. XXVII, XXIII-XXIV). (39) The fact that 11Q19 is clearly patched and cared for, along with the overlap of content in columns V and VI are strong arguments for sheet one being a true replacement sheet.

4Q41 is a different story. The manuscript itself is small in size, made up of 6 columns of text. Column I, the only column on a complete sheet, was originally attached to the right of columns II – VI, but there is evidence of stitching on both sides of the sheet. The passages

(34) I am grateful to Eibert Tigchelaar for making me aware of Charlotte Hempel's chapter from 2000 where she first discusses the issue of the first sheet of 4Q216: Charlotte Hempel, "The Place of the *Book of Jubilees* at Qumran and Beyond," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 187-96.

(35) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 118.

(36) Sidnie White Crawford, "4QDeutⁿ," in *Qumran Cave 4, IX, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 117-28.

(37) Yigael Yadin, ed., *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

(38) *Ibid.*, 11-12.

(39) *Ibid.*, 12.

represented in this manuscript are Deut 8:5-10 and 5:1-6:1, (40) in that order. Column I is the complete text of Deut 8:5-10 and contains no indications of a preceding text nor does it anticipate a continuation, as the column retains open space at the bottom, 5 empty lines where the parchment is visibly scored. In other words, it is quite clear that Column I was once intended to be a single text on a single sheet. Also, the text beginning on sheet two (column II) begins at the start of Deut 5. Thus, it is not clear that one would have to reconstruct a preceding text to make the extant text fit. Further, the manuscript contains only 12 lines of text per column, with relatively large handwriting. It is highly unlikely that this would be the style of a manuscript intended to include the entire text of Deuteronomy. Based on all this, White Crawford has convincingly concluded that 4Q41 “is not a true biblical manuscript, but a text made and used for some devotional and/or study purpose.” (41) While the actual purpose may be a matter of debate, it seems clear that a purpose other than an entire copy of Deuteronomy is both reasonable and possible here.

Sheet 1 of 4Q216

The first sheet of 4Q216, like 4Q41 and 11Q19, is obviously attached after the copying of the rest of the scroll and is written by a different hand. Like 4Q41, and unlike 11Q19, the first sheet does not contain overlapping text that would indicate that the two originally were meant to be together. If we accept the placement of the fragments in DJD 13, then like 4Q41, the text beginning on sheet 2 of 4Q216 is the beginning of a chapter or section, meaning that there is no carry over or repeated text, as in 11Q19. It follows that sheet 2 of 4Q216, then, actually does not have to have been the second sheet of a work, but could have been the first (or only) sheet of the original manuscript. (42)

The literary structure of *Jubilees* also supports viewing chapter 2 (sheet 2) as a complete unit, amended at a later point by a framing text. (43) Chapter 1 is clearly an introductory text that is an addition to the following sequence, setting the scene for the events that are to unfold and explaining the existence of the book. Chapter 2 begins the

(40) White Crawford, “4QDeut^a.”

(41) Sidnie White Crawford, “4QDtⁿ: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls* (ed. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 13-20 (at 20).

(42) See Hempel, “The Place of the *Book of Jubilees* at Qumran and Beyond,” 190.

(43) See *ibid.*

creation narrative and though it is not easily confused with the text of Gen 1-2, it is discernible as parallel in many aspects. (44) Given the dimensions of 4Q216, it is highly unlikely that the manuscript could have contained the entire text of the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. It is then plausible to think that the text of sheet two was either an excerpt of, or precursor to, *Jubilees*. Tigchelaar has convincingly noted that the content of the last lines of the final column of 4Q216 retain themes that connect to the wider literary unity of *Jubilees* ruling out 4Q216 as a source text. (45) As the materiality and the text of 4Q216 point to the likelihood of it being an excerpt or abbreviated text, it seems unlikely that someone would go to the trouble of replacing the first sheet of such a manuscript. (46) Like 4Q41, it seems much more likely that there was some other purpose to the addition of the first sheet, possibly even a material confirmation of the process of redaction taking place in *Jubilees* during the first century B.C.E. (47) Eibert Tigchelaar has also suggested that the text of 4Q217 may reflect a different form of the text of *Jub.* 1:29, (48) indicating that that portion of *Jubilees* was still under development during the mid-first century B.C.E. If that is the case, it strengthens the arguments that 4Q216 could show materially the development of *Jubilees* during the second and first centuries B.C.E.—at Qumran. As the text of sheet one of 4Q216 is identifiable as containing parts of *Jub.* 1 known from Ethiopic *Jubilees*, we could speculate that part of a major redaction of *Jubilees* as we now know it, possibly took place at Qumran. (49)

The Text of 4Q216

4Q216 corresponds to parts of what is known from Ethiopic *Jubilees* Prologue, 1:1-2, 4-15, 26-28 and 2:1-4, 7-24. On the one hand, it is clear that the extant fragments are close enough to the Ethiopic *Jubilees* tradition to be ordered and placed within the general conception of Ethiopic *Jubilees*. On other hand, there are also important

(44) For a full discussion of the relationship between the creation story in *Jubilees* and the Hebrew Bible see Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees* (SJSJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

(45) Tigchelaar, “The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book.”

(46) This was first pointed out to me by Kipp Davis (P.C.).

(47) See Tigchelaar, “The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book.”

(48) Ibid.

(49) See *ibid.*

differences between the text of 4Q216 and the Ethiopic *Jubilees* tradition, which shows that the state of the text is not entirely static. In general, the identification of the close context of the fragments in DJD 13 is plausible, and I see no reason to challenge them as such, especially considering the small amount of text. However, it is clear that there are major differences as well. VanderKam and Milik find 34 smaller or larger variants (not including orthographical issues) between the Hebrew and the Ethiopic in the 79 lines of very fragmentary text that make up 4Q216. (50) Considering that the amount of reconstructed text in the edition outweighs the extant text by almost 3 to 1, it follows that there are likely many more differences between the Hebrew text and Ethiopic *Jubilees* than are visible here. The reconstruction of text here may have created the impression of a greater degree of agreement between the Hebrew text of 4Q216 and Ethiopic *Jubilees* than there is evidence for.

In the following, I will briefly discuss a few of the issues that arise in the reading of the Hebrew text in light of the other versions of *Jubilees*.

4Q216 of *Jub.* 1:27

A very interesting and important reading is found in 4Q216 frag. 12 col. 1 line 1 = Column IV 6 = *Jub.* 1:27. The text of this passage has been the subject of detailed examination in scholarship. (51) The Hebrew text reads:

[מלאך ה]פָּנִים לְהַכְתִּיב

[*The Angel of P*]resence to dictate

The majority of Ethiopic manuscripts read: (52)

ወይዘሉ ለመልእክ : ገጽ : ጸሐፊ : ለመሆ

And he [God] said to the Angel of Presence “write for Moses...”

(50) VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 4.

(51) James C. VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” *JSS* 26 (1981): 209-17; Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

(52) Charles and VanderKam are identical here. VanderKam lists the variants discussed below. See Robert H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 4, and James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 6.

This small Hebrew fragment is thus of importance to the understanding of how the Jubilees is perceived, whether it was written by the hand of the Angel of Presence, or if it was dictated by the angel and written down by Moses. The Ethiopic manuscripts are completely in agreement in reading a G-stem imperative **ጸሐፍ** in this verse. (53) The first verb in the verse, **ወይቤሎ** does not have a specified subject here, but continues the divine speech that was begun in *Jub.* 1:22. There are, however, 3 manuscripts that read: (54)

ወይቤሎ : መልአክ : ገጽ : ለሙሴ : ጸሐፍ

And the Angel of Presence said to Moses, “write...”

Here, there are two minor differences that affect the subject and object of the sentence. The first verb is the same, but the Angel of Presence is here understood as the subject, without the preposition **ለ**. In addition, the accusative **ለሙሴ** is here located *before* the imperative **ጸሐፍ**, making it the accusative of the first verb, not the following imperative, as it is in the other manuscripts. Thus, Moses is the writer, not the Angel. Thus, despite the fact that it is Moses who is seen as doing the writing in these three manuscripts, the verb in question in 4Q216 does not vary. It is still clear that the majority of manuscripts read this verse to imply that the Angel of Presence wrote the law for Moses. Hence, within the Ethiopic *Jubilees*, there are contradictions as to who the author of *Jubilees* was, Moses or the Angel of Presence, between this passage, along with the text of *Jub.* 30:12, 21; 50:6, 13 which clearly point to the Angel of Presence as the author, against *Jub.* 1:5, 7, 26; 2:1; 23:32; 33:18 which seem to point to Moses as the author. (55) This phenomenon is not unexpected per se, as the MT of Exodus and Deuteronomy show multiple texts that reflect differing understandings of who does the writing of the law. In Exod 24:4; 34:28 and Deut 31:9, 24 Moses is perceived as the author, whereas God is described as writing the law in Exod 24:12; 31:18; 32:16; 34:1 and Deut 4:13; 5:22; 10:2, 4.

Already in 1981, James VanderKam proposed that the Ethiopic manuscripts of 1:27 likely reflect a mistranslation into Greek of the Hebrew *hip'il* as a *qal* that was perpetuated into the Ethiopic manuscripts. This means that the causative form “to dictate” would be

(53) Following the terminology of Thomas O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic* (HSS 24; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

(54) E.g. Mss. 17, 21 and 63, in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 6. See also James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), XIX-XXXI.

(55) VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” 209-10.

mistakenly rendered “to write.” (56) The presence of a *hip^cil* infinitive in 4Q216 offers evidence of the reading that VanderKam proposed. In the history of research on *Jubilees* this was deemed quite an important find, but the question remains what is the value of finding this reading in the Hebrew text, and whether one should emend all Ethiopic texts based on the presence of this reading in Hebrew.

The Ethiopic tradition has clearly read this important verse not as “to dictate” but “to write,” thus placing the initial and paradigmatic text on the authorship of *Jubilees* not in the hands of Moses, but in the hand of the Angel of Presence. The implications of the understanding of the text are broad, even though there is internal inconsistency; it is clear from the framing texts of 1:27 and 50:13 that Ethiopic *Jubilees* places the revelation of the text in the hand of the Angel of Presence. That the Hebrew text read “to dictate” shows that in the first century B.C.E. the text was understood as being written down by the hand of Moses—much in the same way as the Torah was perceived. But again, we are met with the examples provided above where the Torah is not consistent in the presentation of who does the writing of the law. Further, the presence of the *hip^cil* infinitive does not change the fact the Ethiopic tradition has consistently and up to this day perceived the author as divine. It seems possible that the difference could be theologically motivated and not the result of a mistranslation, and that the change could go in both directions. It is quite conceivable that the changing theological climate motivated a slight move from revelation through Moses to revelation through an Angelic presence, or vice versa.

4Q216 of *Jub.* 2:17

One of the largest differences between the text of 4Q216 and Ethiopic *Jubilees* is found at fragment 18 lines 5-8 = col. VII 5-8 = *Jub.* 2:17, from the final column of 4Q216. The Hebrew text here is very fragmentary, but it can be assumed that a retroversion of Ethiopic *Jubilees* would not fill the entire space. In other words, there is a large section that is present in the earliest Qumran material that is lacking in the Ethiopic. The Syriac *Anonymous Chronicle of 1234* (57) and Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus* (58) have long been understood

(56) Ibid.

(57) Jean-Baptiste Chabot, *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* (2 vols.; Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae, 1920).

(58) Albert-Marie Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca* (PsVTG 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 74.

Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, (65) reads:

και ἀνεπαύσατο ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
ἡμέρᾳ και ἡλόγησεν αὐτὴν και ἡγίασεν αὐτήν

*And God rested from all of his works on the seventh day.
And he blessed it and sanctified it.*

The phrase **אשר שבת ב** is not found in Ethiopic *Jubilees*, but may be compared to the phrasing of the Syriac. The rest of the line must also be considered as a phrase that is lacking in all the later versions. The phrase **ששת ימים** is extant in the Ethiopic as well, but seems to fit a different context than the Hebrew. No matter how it is read, even accounting for all of the Ethiopic text, the Hebrew text leaves a gap of at least a line and a half in 4Q216. The Syriac Chronicle and Epiphanius, while possibly retaining part of the Hebrew text that is not extant in Ethiopic, still do not fill the gap, and seem to be closer to the text of Gen 2:3 than *Jubilees*. In other words—there was text at this point in the Hebrew that is not clearly reflected in the later versions.

CONCLUSION

The general scholarly acceptance and the high status of historical critical philological paradigms has caused most modern commentators to accept the position argued for by VanderKam about the state of the text. This has led to the development of two different widely held assumptions about *Jubilees*. The first is that there were (at least) 14 copies of *Jubilees* at Qumran. The second is that the text of *Jubilees* at Qumran is remarkably close to the text of Ethiopic *Jubilees*. The application of the first assumption leads to an expectation of the literary stability of *Jubilees* during the Qumran period. The application of the second leads to comparisons of the Ethiopic text, or a translation of it, with the text of Genesis and Exodus in order to describe the practices of biblical interpretation and rewriting of scripture that are employed in *Jubilees*, and thus a description of the practice of biblical interpretation in Judea during the second century B.C.E. (66) However, if the philological procedures and paradigms that make these

(65) Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca*, 74.

(66) See for example Van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*; Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: the Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (JSJSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2012); John C. Endres, S.J. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987).

assumptions viable do not represent the manuscript evidence in a fruitful way, these hypotheses on second-century B.C.E. hermeneutical practices should perhaps also be revisited. By viewing the existing evidence from the perspective of material philology, I would suggest that the manuscripts do not seem to indicate that there was such a great level of literary and textual stability as has been previously suggested, and that not all of the 14 manuscripts that contain texts related to *Jubilees* are copies of the work known from the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. The reformulation of the understanding of *Jubilees* during the Qumran period and the way in which the connection between the Hebrew Qumran manuscripts and Ethiopic *Jubilees* are presented will also influence the way the text of *Jubilees* is used in scholarship in general.

When it comes to our understanding of 4Q216, I would make three specific claims: 1) 4Q216 is not likely to have ever had or been meant to have a text corresponding to the entire work now known as *Jubilees*. 2) It is very likely that both the literary form and the text of *Jubilees* were still developing during the Qumran period. 3) The variation between the Hebrew text and the Ethiopic is such that we cannot continue to claim great continuity in the transmission of *Jubilees* at the philological level. Instead, it seems more fruitful to view the text as emerging in the contexts of copying, in new literary and manuscript contexts. There is no doubt that the text is related to the work, but the number and significance of the variants show that it would be better to be cautious in describing 4Q216 as a witness to a “final” edition of *Jubilees*. Further examination from this material perspective of the remaining *Jubilees* fragments from Qumran offers other, promising finds concerning the shape and transmission of *Jubilees*.

Matthew Phillip MONGER

THE USE AND INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK OF *JUBILEES* IN THE *MĀṢĤĀFĀ MILAD*

Summary

This contribution deals with the use and interpretation of the book of *Jubilees* in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*. Most references to the book of *Jubilees* in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* are explicit quotations, the wording of which is very close to the text of *Jubilees*. Despite the abundant explicit mentions, the actual number of passages is very limited: *Jub.* 4:17-25 (Enoch), *Jub.* 16:1-5 (Abraham receiving the three men, as a symbol of the Trinity), often combined with *Jub.* 1:27-28; 2:2, 18 (angel of the presence; angel of the sanctification). The only exception to this are the passages that allude to Adam (*Jub.* 3:27) and the early life of Abraham (*Jub.* 11:18; 12:12-14; 14-15). The book of *Jubilees* is read and interpreted through Christian eyes, in particular it is seen to express the Trinitarian view of Zar'a Ya'aqob. This is no different from how the text interprets the Old Testament. In other words, the book of *Jubilees* is read in the same way as other books of the Old Testament.

A STUDY of the reception history of the book of *Jubilees* holds great interest because the book itself is largely a reception history of older material. (1) The book is presented as the transcript of a revelation of forty days and nights received by Moses on Mount Sinai. Nevertheless, it is apparent that *Jubilees* presupposes the material that can be found in Genesis 1 to Exodus 19, most of which

(1) See J. C. VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2008): 405-431 (esp. 409-412). See also J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000); idem, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (JSJSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

is presented in the same sequential order, and nearly all pericopes can be discerned in the new composition. It is true, of course, that there are many differences between the older scriptural text and the version incorporated into the new composition, but the use and interpretation of the scriptural material show that the author of *Jubilees* acknowledges the existence and authority of the Torah. At the same time, the book offers more material than Genesis and Exodus alone, with other sources and traditions also incorporated into the book. One can point to the addition of material originating from the Enochic traditions (*Jub.* 4:15-26; 5:1-12; 7:20-39; 10:1-17), to traditions upon which the *Aramaic Levi Document* is based (see, for example, *Jub.* 31-32), and to the influence of *4QVisions of Amram* (see *Jub.* 46). Thus, in the book of *Jubilees*, one can speak of a fusing together and reconciliation of different Jewish streams in the second century B.C.E. (2)

Whatever the intention of the author or the composer of the book—to replace Genesis or not (3)—the history of interpretation shows that both Genesis and the book of *Jubilees* continued to be read, sometimes side by side. (4) The discovery of fourteen, possibly fifteen, fragments of *Jubilees* among the Dead Sea Scrolls shows that the book was authoritative in one way or another in the early Jewish period, (5) and it proves in any case that the book was read. (6) Moreover, the book of *Jubilees* exerted influence on the foundational writings of Qumran, among which the *Damascus Document* is the most

(2) Cf. Van Ruiten, *Abraham*, 9-12.

(3) Although *Jubilees* acknowledges the Torah, it seems to claim a greater authority for its own revelation than for that of the Torah. Cf. J. J. Collins, "The Genre of the Book of *Jubilees*," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. E. F. Mason et al.; JSJSup 153; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 2:737-755 (esp. 746). In this respect Hindy Najman emphasizes four authority conferring strategies in the book of *Jubilees*. See H. Najman, "Interpretation As Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379-410, esp. 408 (repr. in: idem, *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* [JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 39-71); eadem, "Reconsidering *Jubilees*: Prophecy and Exemplarity," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 229-243 (repr. in *Past Renewals*, 189-204).

(4) Sometimes, *Jubilees*' inventions came to be received simply as the traditional meaning of Genesis itself. See A. Y. Reed, "Retelling Biblical Retellings: Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Clementines, and the Reception-History of *Jubilees*," <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/13th/papers/Reed.pdf> (accessed 1-5-2014).

(5) See J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2012), 3, 73-77.

(6) See D. Hamidović, *Les traditions du Jubilé à Qumrân* (Orientis Sémitiques; Paris: Geuthner, 2007).

important. (7) In the later literature of rabbinic Judaism there is little evidence of the use of *Jubilees*, although in medieval Hebrew literature there seems to be various echoes of the book. (8)

Within early Christianity, *Jubilees* was not especially well known before the fourth century. Afterwards, however, it seems to have come into its own. The exegetical value of *Jubilees* was acknowledged in the titles by which the work was known in Greek. In his *Panarion*, Epiphanes (ca. 310-403) speaks of *Jubilees* as the “Little Genesis” (*leptē Genesei*). Later Greek authors also speak of *Jubilees* using this or a related title, “Leptogenesis.” According to the Byzantine chronicler Syncellus (ninth century), the “Little Genesis” was also known as the “Apocalypse of Moses,” while he also refers to the work as the “Details of Genesis (*ta leptā Geneseōs*).” It was probably not read as a work on its own but as an elaboration or explanation of the book of Genesis. Adler has rightly pointed out that when we find traditions in later literature, also known from *Jubilees*, it remains unclear whether we can posit any influence per se, direct or indirect. There are few literal quotations; moreover, texts originating from *Jubilees* underwent revisions time and again, quotations from different sources were conflated, and there were misattributions. The result of this reworking and updating of the traditions based on *Jubilees* is that the authors who quoted them were often not aware that they had originated in a book whose authority was not universally accepted. (9)

The Book of *Jubilees* in Ethiopia

A somewhat underexposed field of interest is the reception history of the book of *Jubilees* within the context of the Ethiopian Orthodox

(7) See C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 85-86; A. Dorman, “The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls” (PhD dissertation, University of Groningen, 2007), 89-136; VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, 77.

(8) M. Himmelfarb, “Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 115-141; M. Kister, “Ancient Material in Pirke de-Rabbi Eli‘ezer: Basilides, Qumran, The Book of *Jubilees*,” in *‘Go Out and Study the Land’ (Judg 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. M. Maeir, J. Magness, and L. H. Schiffman; JSJSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 69-93.

(9) See W. Adler, “The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 211-228 (esp. 228). I am very grateful to William Adler who provided me with two of his still unpublished papers on the reception history of the book of *Jubilees*, one of which is “Parabiblical Traditions and their Use in the Palaea Historica.”

Church. The impact of *Jubilees* in Ethiopia seems to be evident, due to the fact that a Greek version of the book was translated into Gē'ēz at some point in history. (10) Moreover, this translation is the only version of the book that is preserved in its entirety. *Jubilees* is incorporated into both the smaller and the larger canons in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. (11) For his critical edition of the book of *Jubilees*, VanderKam used 27 Ethiopic manuscripts. (12) In a recent publication, Ted Erho mentioned 23 additional exemplars. (13) This evidence suggests that the book exerted some influence on the cultural and religious heritage of Ethiopia. In fact, the influence of the book of *Jubilees* (*Mäṣḥāfä Kufale*) can be found in the literature of the period of King Zar'a Ya'aqob, such as *Mäṣḥāfä Bēṛhan*, *Mäṣḥāfä Milad* and the *Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth*. (14)

(10) Cf. M. A. Knibb, *Translating the Bible: The Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1995* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

(11) The Bible in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church is much more extensive than either the Catholic or the Protestant Bibles. Both the smaller and the larger canon contain 81 works. The smaller canon has 54 books of the Old Testament and 27 of the New Testament, and the larger canon has 46 Old Testament books and 35 New Testament books. See R. Cowley, "The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 23 (1974): 318-323. For a reflection on the concept of canon in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, see also L. Baynes, "Enoch and *Jubilees* in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church," in *A Teacher for all Generations*, 799-818 (esp. 801-807). In Ethiopia today, there is a trend to only publish Bibles of the limited Protestant size, as Ethiopic Bible translations are sponsored by various Protestant Churches. See L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Book of Enoch: its Reception in Second Temple Jewish and in Christian Tradition," *Early Christianity* 4 (2013): 7-30.

(12) J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees, I* (CSCO 510, Scriptores Aethiopici 87; Louvain: Peeters, 1989), xiv-xvi; see also idem, "Recent Scholarship," 409-412; idem, "The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, 3-21 (esp. 18-20).

(13) T. Erho, "New Ethiopic Witnesses to some Old Testament Pseudepigrapha," *BSOAS* 76 (2013): 75-97 (esp. 77-90). In a private communication, Ted Erho mentioned that upon further review it was determined that one of these 23 copies (Gunda Gundē 146) happened to be VanderKam, no. 23. He also mentioned the existence of three further copies of *Jubilees*: Dabra Mārḳos 10; May Wayni ms. 3 (http://eap.bl.uk/database/overview_item.a4d?catId=117775;r=20537); and Addigrat Catholic Theological College (ACTC) ms. 5 (cf. R. Zarzeczny, "Inventario dei manoscritti etiopici conservati presso la biblioteca del Seminario Maggiore ad Adigrat (Etiopia)," *OCP* 80 (2014): 199-260, at 214-215). For the last, the siglum ACTC-005 is the record under which the manuscript was photographed by the Ethio-SPARE project, but it appears as Ms. 17 in Zarzeczny's catalogue.

(14) For a description of Ethiopian literature, see E. Ullendorff, *The Ethiopians: An Introduction to Country and People* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press,

In this contribution, I will concentrate on just one of these books from the rich literary heritage of Ethiopia, the *Māṣĥāfā Milad*. (15) This is one of the works attributed to king Zar'a Ya'aqob (1434-1486), a great military and political leader and religious reformer, during whose reign (in the mid-fifteenth century) there was a flowering of Ethiopian literature. (16) It is a collection of fourteen sermons each assigned to the monthly remembrance of the birth of Christ. The Ethiopian Orthodox Church teaches that Jesus was born on the 29th of *Taḥsas* (in a leap year on the 28th of *Taḥsas*). Two months (*Gēnbot* and *Ṭēqēmt*) have sermons for both the 28th and the 29th. Thus, in total, the *Māṣĥāfā Milad* contains fourteen sermons of very different length. (17)

According to Klaus Wendt, the book is a collection of texts which have different literary origins. (18) Consequently, he and others argue that it is more likely that the work was composed by high-ranking clergy under the auspices of the king in order to give expression to his views. They reflect the Christological and ecclesiastical controversies of the day. According to Wendt, it is a compilation of decrees of the council and synodic protocols (from different periods), royal decrees (with regard to ecclesiastical life and discipline), and of catechetical and homiletical pieces (which also give a unity to the whole). During his life, Zar'a Ya'aqob ordained this book to all churches in the country for liturgical use, but it was lost almost completely, according to Ethiopian

1973), 131-151. For the impact of Biblical literature in Ethiopia, see idem, *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).

(15) For the text and translation, see: K. Wendt, ed., *Das Mashafa Milad (Liber Nativitatis) und Mashafa Sellase (Liber Trinitatis) des Kaisers Zar'a Ya'aqob* (CSCO 221-222, 235-236; Scriptores Aethiopioci 41-44; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1962-1963).

(16) A. Dillmann, *Über die Regierung, insbesondere die Kirchenordnung des Königs Zar'a-Jacob* (Philosophische und historische Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 2; Berlin, 1884); Ullendorff, *The Ethiopians*, 141-144; D. Crummey, "Church and Nation: the Ethiopian Orthodox Tawahedo Church (from the thirteenth to the twentieth century)," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, V., *Eastern Christianity* (ed. M. Angold; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 457-487.

(17) K. Wendt, "Die Theologischen Auseinandersetzungen in der Äthiopischen Kirche zur Zeit der Reformen des XV. Jahrhunderts," in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1960), 137-146; Getatchew Haile, "Milad: Mashafa milad," *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, 3: 964-965.

(18) Wendt, "Die Theologischen Auseinandersetzungen," 137-146; idem, ed., *Das Mashafa Milad*, iii.

tradition, because of the Islamic invasion shortly after the death of Zar'a Ya'aqob. Because of this, Wendt's edition of the text is based on one manuscript (Paris, Abbadianus 62). (19) According to Uhlig, this manuscript can be dated to the fifteenth century. (20)

Each homily in the *Māṣṣāfā Milad* opens with a renunciation of Satan, a formula still known today from the beginning of the daily prayer. (21) The work is strongly apologetic with regard to the incarnation of the Word through the temporal birth of Christ from Mary, and to the Christian Trinitarian theology, which also touches on the eternal birth of the Word from the Father. (22) It is also highly polemical in its addressing of two distinct groups that resisted the king's theology of the Trinity. Firstly, the Jews, who did not believe in the existence of God in the Trinity ("Listen, o Jew full of treacherousness, to the mystery of the pure Trinity"); and secondly, a group of Christians, commonly identified as Stephanites, who defined the Trinity in a different way ("Hear, o man, the important basis of the mystery of the Trinity, that you deny"). (23)

The Use of the Book of *Jubilees* in the *Māṣṣāfā Milad*

There are references to the book of *Jubilees* in five of the fourteen homilies of the *Māṣṣāfā Milad*:

(19) Wendt, *Das Mashafa Milad*, i-iii. Cf. A. d'Abbadie, *Catalogue raisonné de manuscrits éthiopiens* (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1859). In a private communication, Ted Erho mentioned the existence of another early manuscript, probably from the fifteenth century (EMML 6838; Cf. Getatchew Haile, "Milad," 965). According to him, particularly notable is the lack of any known manuscript from Shewa, in comparison to three recent manuscripts from East Tigray. It seems that there may be a regional component to the circulation and copying of this text. One other modern manuscript of *Māṣṣāfā Milad* was digitized for one of the British Library Endangered Archives Programme projects (see http://eap.bl.uk/database/overview_item.a4d?-catId=33516;r=26299).

(20) S. Uhlig, *Äthiopische Paläographie* (Äthiopische Forschungen 22; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1988), 276-277; see also M. A. Knibb, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (SVTP 22; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 180.

(21) Getatchew Haile, "Milad," 964-965. The formula reads: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God. Believing and taking refuge in the Holy Trinity, I denounce you, Satan, before my (holy) mother Church, which is my witness Mary Zion. Amen." For the text, see K. Wendt, ed., *Das Mashafa Milad*, 1 et passim.

(22) Getatchew Haile, "Milad," 965; Baynes, "Enoch and *Jubilees*," 810.

(23) Getatchew Haile, "Milad," *ibidem*.

<i>Māṣḥāfā Milad</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 41:66-68)	4:17-19 4:19 4:22-25 1:27 16:1-5
Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:81-86)	1:27-28 1:28 2:18 16:1 16:1-4 16:1-5
Homily of the 29th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:123)	4:17
Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:56-57)	3:27 11:18 12:12-14 14:1-20 15
Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭeqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:78-85)	1:27-28 1:28 1:29 2:2 2:18 2:18-19

In four of these five homilies, the book is mentioned by its name—30 times in total—either as *Māṣḥāfā Kufale* (21 times) or as *Kufale* (9 times). In most cases, the explicit mention of the book of *Jubilees* is followed by a literary quotation from the book. A few times after the explicit mention of the book, there is a more global reference to the content of *Jubilees*, in which case one can speak of an explicit allusion or summarizing reference. In the homily for the 29th of the month of *Maskaram* there is no explicit mention of the book. However, we do find at least three phrases that can be traced to the book of *Jubilees*: one implicit quotation and two implicit allusions (see below).

Some authors have suggested that Zar’a Ya’aqob relied heavily upon *Jubilees*. (24) However, it is worth noting that the passages of

(24) Getatchew Haile, “A Study of the Issues Raised in Two Homilies of Zār’a Ya’aqob,” *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 131 (1981): 85-113 (esp. 91); Baynes, “Enoch and *Jubilees*,” 808.

the book of *Jubilees* that are quoted or alluded to in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* are distributed very unevenly, as one can see in the following table:

<i>Jubilees</i>	<i>Māṣḥāfā Milad</i>
1:27	Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 42:67-68)
1:27-28	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 42:81-82)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:80)
1: 28	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:82-83)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:83)
1:29	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:81)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:83)
2:2	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:79-80)
2:18	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:86)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:78)
2:18-19	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:78)
3:27	Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:56)
4:17	Homily of the 29th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:123)
4:17-19	Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 41:66)
4:19	Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 41:67)
4:22-25	Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 41:67)
11:18	Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:57)
12:12-14	Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:57)
14:1-20	Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:57)
15	Homily of the 29th of <i>Maskaram</i> (Wendt, 43:57)
16:1	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:81)
16:1-4	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:83)
16:1-5	Homily of the 29th of <i>Miyazya</i> (Wendt, 41:68)
	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:80-81)
	Homily of the 28th of <i>Gēnbot</i> (Wendt, 41:85)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:83)
	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:85)
16:15	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:85)
16:15-16	Homily of the 29th of <i>Ṭēqēmt</i> (Wendt, 43:83, 85)

As is apparent in the table, only a limited number of texts from the book of *Jubilees* are used, and there are no quotations from the text after Chapter 16. Also, as mentioned above, the distribution of the quotations from the first part of the book is very uneven. Most texts refer to Abraham (fifteen references to *Jub.* 11-16), and to the angel of the presence and the angel of holiness (twelve references to *Jub.* 1-2).

Apart from this, there are four references to Enoch that are related to the book of *Jubilees* (i.e., a quotation from *Jub.* 4:17-25). (25) Finally, there is also one reference to Adam (*Jub.* 3:27). With regard to the Abraham story, apart from the implicit allusions to the episodes from his early life (*Jub.* 11-15), *Māṣḥāfā Milad* mainly quotes from the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Jub.* 16:1-5). In most cases, the references to the angels of the presence and of holiness are related to the references to *Jub.* 16 and are taken from a limited number of verses (*Jub.* 1:27-28; 2:2, 18). Thus, the extensive use of explicit quotations from *Jubilees* relies on a very limited range of the text.

The Quotations

Most of the manuscripts of *Jubilees* can be dated to the sixteenth century or later, with only a few coming from the fifteenth century. (26) The textual tradition of the Ethiopic text of the book of *Jubilees* itself was quite stable, (27) while the situation beyond the manuscripts themselves is less clear. In this respect, the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* is an interesting witness, since this text is dated to the fifteenth century. (28) In his German translation of the book of *Jubilees*, Klaus Berger remarks that the quotations from *Jubilees* in Christian homilies are about the same age as the oldest preserved Ethiopic manuscripts of *Jubilees*. (29) According to Berger, they all date from homilies that originated in the time of Zar'a Ya'aqob, the quotations do not agree with any of the known manuscripts, and they would have moved through an independent textual history.

After having compared the quotations in Wendt's edition of the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* with VanderKam's critical edition of *Jubilees*, including its variant readings, my overall conclusion is that the text of the references to *Jubilees* in *Māṣḥāfā Milad* is very close to the actual text

(25) It may be clear that there are many more references to Enoch in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*, as it quotes extensively from the *First Book of Enoch*, and from the mention of Enoch in the New Testament. See M. A. Knibb, "The Text-Critical Value of the Quotations from *1 Enoch* in Ethiopic Writings," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Veronne; BETL 192; Louvain: Peeters, 2005), 225-235; cf. also Baynes, "Enoch and *Jubilees*," 815-818.

(26) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, I, xv; see also idem, "The Manuscript Tradition," 18-19. Erho, "New Ethiopic Witnesses," 77-90.

(27) VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition," 20-21.

(28) The manuscript on which Wendt's critical edition is based also dates from the fifteenth century (Paris, Abbadianus 62). See note 20-21.

(29) K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ 2.3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 293.

of *Jubilees*. If a reading deviates from the critical edition of *Jubilees*, such as orthographic variations, or small grammatical differences, then in nearly all cases this variant reading can be found in one of the manuscripts that is used for the critical edition. Despite these variant readings, in the majority of the cases, manuscript 12 (= ms A in Charles' system) is mentioned, which is generally seen as one of the most ancient manuscripts of *Jubilees*, dated to the fifteenth century. It belongs, however, to an inferior family. (30) The similarities of these readings with manuscript 12 should not be exaggerated, however, because many of the other variations of manuscript 12 are not mentioned in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*, and it only quotes a few passages from the book of *Jubilees*. Nevertheless, the limited number of quotations supports the observation of a stable textual tradition of the book, also beyond the actual manuscripts.

With regard to the actual wording, several small differences occur, such as orthographical and small grammatical changes. An 'ayin of the 7th order rather than an 'ayin of the 1st order occurs about ten times. (31) In a few places, one can find the addition of a suffix (3rd person plural; 1st person singular), (32) and twice there is an omission of the copulativum wā. (33) In some cases, it is not immediately clear who is the subject of a sentence at the beginning of a quotation from *Jubilees*. In two cases, the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* does not hesitate to add the subject, in one case we see *Enoch* as an addition to wāsmē'ā ("He testified") in the quotation of *Jub.* 4:22 in the homily of the 29th of *Miyazya*; and once 'egziabēher ("God") as an addition to wājēbelo ("He said") in the quotation of *Jub.* 1:27 in the homily of the 28th of *Gēnbot*.

Jub. 1:27-28 is quoted five times in the homilies. In these verses, the Lord is addressing the angel of the presence. In the critical edition by VanderKam, *Jub.* 1:28 reads: "And all will know that *I am* ('ānā) the God of Israel." However, the reading "And all will know that *You are* ('āntā) the God of Israel" has stronger manuscript support. (34) According to VanderKam, this can hardly be correct in this context where the Lord is addressing an angel. (35) However, in all five cases

(30) J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, II, xix-xx.

(31) See quotation of *Jub.* 4:17-19 in the homily of the 29th of *Miyazya* (Wendt, I:59-60), and of *Jub.* 1:28 in the homily of the 28th of *Gēnbot* (Wendt, I:73).

(32) See quotation of *Jub.* 2:19 in the homily of the 29th of *Tēqēmt* (Wendt, II:68).

(33) See quotation of *Jub.* 2:2 in the homily of the 29th of *Tēqēmt* (Wendt, II:70).

(34) Among other manuscripts also the eldest ones (9 and 12) as well as ms 25, which served as the basis for the editions of Charles and VanderKam, read 'āntā.

(35) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, II, 6. According to VanderKam, the reading 'āntā probably arose as miscopying of 'ānā. However, it might also have been

where the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* quotes *Jub.* 1:27-28, it has this latter reading (“*You are the God of Israel*”).

With regard to the quotation of *Jub.* 16:3 (“We told her the name of her son as *it is ordained and written on* [šēru‘ wāṣḥuf wēstā] the heavenly tablets”), three different readings of this verse can be found in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*. In the homily of the 28th of *Gēnbot*, one can read first, “We told her the name of her son as *it is ordained in the writing of his name on* [šēru‘ bāmāṣḥāf sēmu bā] the heavenly tablets” (Wendt, 41:81). This is a unique reading by the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*. The second quotation of *Jub.* 16:3, also in the homily of the 28th of *Gēnbot*, comes close to the critical reading of *Jubilees*, but it has the addition of *sēmu*: “We told her the name of her son as *his name is ordained and written on* [šēru‘ wāṣḥuf sēmu wēstā] the heavenly tablets” (Wendt, 41:85). The third time, in the homily of the 28th of *Ṭeqēmt*, we read, “as *his name is written and ordained on* the heavenly tablets [ṣḥuf wāṣēr‘ē bāsmu wēstā]” (Wendt, 43:83). Here, there is also an addition of *sāmu*, but also a transposition: ṣḥuf wāṣēr‘ē rather than šēr‘ē wāṣḥēf. However, this transposition occurs in only one manuscript, while in many manuscripts of *Jub.* 16:3 the addition of either *bāsmu* (mss 21, 39, 42, 47, 48) or *sēmu* (12, 58, 63) can be found. (36)

***Jubilees* and Enoch**

An analysis of the quotations from *Jubilees* requires close attention to be paid to the literary context in which they are quoted and the purpose they were meant to serve. In two homilies—of the 29th of *Miyazya* and the 29th of *Gēnbot*—*Jubilees* is quoted in the context of a narrative about Enoch. I restrict myself here to the first homily, in which Enoch is the central figure. He is described as the prophet who foresaw the arrival of Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary and the Son of God. Not only was he the first to prophesy Christ’s birth from Mary, twofold virgin, but he also prophesied his baptism, his manifestation, his death and resurrection, his ascension, his place at the right hand of the Father, and his second coming. To this end, several texts from *I Enoch* are quoted. Enoch is also of the utmost importance because of the arrangement of the stars in relation to the calculation of the

an intentional revision. In that case, already before the Christological discussions under King Zar’a Ya’aqob, the Ethiopic text of *Jubilees* (mss 9 and 12) read *’āntā*, which is the foundation for a Christological reading. It is therefore not the other way around: that on the basis of these Christological discussions, this reading was introduced in *Jubilees*. I thank Eibert Tigchelaar for this observation.

(36) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, I, 93.

festivals and months. The *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 En. 91:12-17) would predict a period of 7,000 years before the coming of Christ.

The extensive quotation of *Jub.* 4:17-25 (37) is taken up in a series of quotations which starts with Gen 5:24 ("Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him"), continues with a reference to the *Didaskalia* ("And the people continued walking in the admonition of the prophet Enoch, who is ascended to heaven"), and then mentions the New Testament author Jude, who quotes extensively from the book of Enoch (1 En. 1:9; cf. Jude 14-15). This series is concluded with an extensive quotation of *Jub.* 4:17-19, 22-25, without associated comment. However, what we do find at the end of the homily is an expression of high esteem for Enoch. The Law and the Prophets, as well as the apostles, acknowledge his honor. Also, the book of *Jubilees* acknowledges this. *Māṣḥāfā Kufale* is not a book like all other books; it is a book written by the angel of the presence. Moreover, this angel is not just an angel like all other angels, but the Son of the pure Mary. God dictated the book of *Jubilees* to his Son.

***Jubilees* and Abraham**

The homily of the 28th of *Gēnbot* deals extensively with Gen 18-19, especially its beginning, in which it is said that Abraham received three men (שלשה אנשים). These three men are not, according to the homily, three ordinary human beings, nor three angels, as is apparently the opinion of some Christians. Neither are they God and his angels. They are the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (three in one, one in three). Thus, the texts speak about the Trinity that appears to Abraham. This homily does not deal with the story of Gen 18-19 as such, but uses elements from the story to show that the Old Testament deals with the appearance of God in three forms. Firstly, Abraham bows before the three men (Gen 18:2). This means that the three men can only be God, because Abraham would not have bowed to angels, nor to God and his angels. Secondly, these men command Abraham (Gen 18:5: "Do as you have said"). This can only be uttered by God and not by the angels, since angels are not capable of commanding men. Thirdly, the fact that Abraham asks Sarah to fetch *three* measures of fine meal (Gen 18:6) is also a reference to the Trinity. After the departure of the men from Abraham's house on their way to Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. Gen 18:16, 22), Yhwh remains behind (cf. Gen 18:22-33), while the text later speaks (at the beginning of Gen 19) of two angels (שני המלאכים; Gen 19:1). According to the homily, God the Son and

(37) Only *Jub.* 4:20-21, which is parallel to Gen 5:21-22, is not taken over.

God the Holy Spirit departed from Abraham on their way to Sodom and Gomorrah, while the third person of the Trinity, God the Father, stayed behind and remained in Abraham's house.

At this stage, an explicit and extensive quotation of *Jub.* 16:1-5 is used. Engaged in a discussion about the two men on their way from Abraham to Sodom and Gomorrah, the homily suggests that these are the angel of the presence and the angel of the sanctification, moving immediately to the conclusion that this does not concern ordinary angels but the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Jubilees is used here to support what the homilist has already said: in Gen 18-19, the three men do not refer to human beings or angels but to the Son and the Holy Spirit. *Jub.* 1:27-28 is quoted in order to prove this. Here God speaks to the angel of the presence. In this speech, more precisely in *Jub.* 1:28, the text argues that five statements prove that the person addressed (the angel of the presence) is in fact Christ. Firstly, the sentence, "*The Lord will appear in the sight of all*" (*Jub.* 1:28a), concerns Christ, in the flesh, born of Mary. The argument is that before his baptism not everyone was able to see his divinity. However, in the Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended on him in the shape of a dove, and the heavenly Father declared "this is my Son" (Matt 3:17), after which the eyes of all Israel were able to see him. Thus, the sentence "*The Lord will appear in the sight of all*" refers typologically to the moment of the baptism of Christ, the moment he became visible to all Israel. Secondly, the reading of the subsequent sentence as "*And all will know that You are ('āntā) the God of Israel*" (38) (*Jub.* 1:28b1) makes it easy to identify the angel of the presence with the Trinity. Jesus Christ is the God of Israel, which is then proved by an allusion to the revelation of God to Moses in Exod 3. Thirdly, the phrase, "*The father of all Jacob's sons*" (*Jub.* 1:28b2), is explained with a reference to Exod 4:22 ("Israel is My first-born son") and Psalm 105:6-7, where the children of Abraham are called the children of Jacob, the chosen ones of the Lord. Fourthly, the expression, "*And the king of Mount Zion*" (*Jub.* 1:28b3), is also said in reference to Christ, as is predicted in the Old Testament. The Psalms (Ps 146:10) are referenced here, where one can read, "Yhwh will reign forever, your God, O Zion, to all generations," and in Isaiah (Isa 59:20) it is said: "And he will come to Zion as redeemer." Finally, the text claims that "*Zion and Jerusalem will become holy*" (*Jub.* 1:28c) only through the blood of Christ.

(38) Here the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* follows the reading of most manuscripts. See note 35.

Thus, in a typological way, the homily attempts to prove that *Jub.* 1:28 speaks about Christ. Both Old and New Testament texts are used to illustrate this, attempting to prove that the text of *Jubilees* does not refer to angels. There is no angel who is called the God of Israel, father of all Jacob's sons and king on Mt Zion. This can only refer to Christ.

According to the homily, God the Son is represented by the angel of the presence. God the Holy Spirit, on the other hand, is represented by the angel of sanctification. In order to prove this, the homily again quotes *Jub.* 16:1-5 extensively. It declares that in this text the mystery of the Trinity is proposed and subsequently proven—regarding the Holy Spirit, in particular—by reference to *Jub.* 2:18 (“He told us—all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness [these two great kinds]—to keep Sabbath with him in heaven and on earth”). Why does this refer to the Trinity? The text argues that the ordinary (created) angels are neither able, nor allowed to rest with God on the Sabbath. They must serve him every day and every minute. Therefore, when the text of *Jubilees* speaks about the angel of the presence and of holiness keeping Sabbath with God on the seventh day, it does not in fact speak about angels but about the Son and the Holy Spirit. (39)

The Implicit References to *Jubilees* in the Homily of the 29th of *Maskaram*

The references to the book of *Jubilees* are all implicit in the homily of the 29th of *Maskaram*. This homily deals with several stages in the life of Christ: from his birth from the virgin Mary until his second coming. The book of Isaiah is quoted extensively throughout the sermon (Isa 7:14; 8:1-4; 9:5-6; 11:1-9; 14:7-8; 19:1-2; 19:18-20; 50:4-9; 53:1-54:1). Jesus is called the Morning Star, who will come to bring light to the world (cf. Isa 30:25-26) which was in darkness from Adam until Abraham. The beginning of this period, the priesthood of Adam, as well as the righteousness of Abraham, are both supported with references to the book of *Jubilees*.

It is said that Adam started the service to God, “On that day, as he was leaving the garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance—frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices—in the early morning when the sun rose at the time,” which can only be an implicit reference to *Jub.* 3:27 with no comment given. The passage is used to present a specific image of Adam as a righteous priest.

(39) The same issue can be found in the very long homily of the 29th of *Ṭeqēmt*.

Following this description, the homily continues with a quotation from the *Didaskalia*, which mentions a line of righteous people that runs from Adam to Christ. Abraham is singled out from this list:

Abraham, however, acknowledged the Lord, when he was only a child of fourteen years old. He burned the temple of idols of his father, in which also his brother Haran was burned in the fire. And he went forth from his homeland to serve his Creator.

He concluded a covenant with his Creator, and started with the ordinance of the circumcision, as his Creator has taught him. Isaac and Jacob served God, in the same way as Abraham, and nobody was found who served the Lord, except Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. After Noah and his children passed away, there was nobody among the peoples who served the Lord, except Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Satan, the nasty devil, ruled in the world of darkness. Then Abraham, the father of Isaac and Jacob, fought against Satan and overcame by the strength of his perfect faith, until his covenant was brought into the tablets of heaven.

The reference to the concluding of the covenant and the circumcision is not sufficiently specific to relate to more than the base texts of Gen 15 and Gen 17. It is probable, however, that the reference to the fourteen-year-old Abraham, who acknowledged the Lord, is a reference to *Jub.* 11:16-12:8 and can be considered to be a summarizing allusion. The reference to the burning of the temple of idols can also be traced to *Jubilees*. Although the motifs also occur in later Jewish and Christian literature, (40) the specific formulation and the context of Abraham as a child of fourteen make it likely that the author is alluding to *Jub.* 12:12-14.

However, it is difficult to link the last part of the quoted text to the book of *Jubilees*. The reference to Noah's children serving the Lord seems to be in contrast with, for example, *Jub.* 6:18, where it is stated that: "from the day of Noah's death, his sons corrupted the festival of Shabuot for seven jubilees and one week of years, until the days of Abraham... Abraham alone kept it. And Isaac and Jacob and his sons kept it." The reference to Abraham, who fights with Satan, may remind us of the battle between Abraham and Mastema in the story of Isaac's binding (*Jub.* 17:15-18:19), but the phrasing in *Māṣḥāfā Milad* is very different from *Jubilees*. It is most probable that this passage concerning Abraham's life is an amalgam of different traditions, one of which is *Jubilees*.

(40) See J. L. Kugel, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 143-144.

Concluding Remarks

Most references to the book of *Jubilees* in the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* are explicit quotations, the wording of which is very close to the text of *Jubilees*. Despite the abundant explicit mentions of the book of *Jubilees*, the actual number of passages is very limited: *Jub.* 4:17-25 (Enoch), *Jub.* 16:1-5 (Abraham receiving the three men, as a symbol of the Trinity), often combined with *Jub.* 1:27-28; 2:2, 18 (angel of the presence; angel of the sanctification). The only exception to this are the passages that allude to Adam (*Jub.* 3:27) and the early life of Abraham (*Jub.* 11:18; 12:12-14; 14-15).

The book of *Jubilees* is read here and interpreted through Christian eyes. In particular, it is seen to express the Trinitarian view of Zar'a Ya'aqob. This is no different from how the text interprets the Old Testament. In other words, the book of *Jubilees* is read in the same way as other books of the Old Testament such as Genesis, the Psalms and the book of Isaiah.

The Trinitarian interpretation of Gen 18-19 might also have been presented without reference to the book of *Jubilees*. Moreover, this interpretation of Gen 18-19 is not unique to the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*. The same kind of exegesis of Gen 18-19 also occurs in the early Church Fathers. (41) There are several patristic texts in which the authors do not focus on the Sodom tradition so much as on the theological problem of God's appearance to humans, in this case his appearance to Abraham. The early Christian interpretations of the three men can in fact be divided into three groups. The first interpretation sees the visitors as angels, which is associated with the Antiochene tradition (e.g., Eutharius of Tyana, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, John Chrysostom). The second, Christological interpretation, considers one of the three visitors to be Christ (e.g., Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Justin Martyr). The third category is the Trinitarian interpretation (a view sometimes expressed by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Tertullian and Augustine). The *Māṣḥāfā Milad* is in complete accordance with this latter interpretation. It rejects the reading of these three men as angels, an interpretation that was most likely present among certain contemporaries of Zar'a Ya'aqob, yet goes back at least to the Church Fathers.

In the *Māṣḥāfā Milad*, *Jubilees* is interpreted along the same lines as Genesis, confirming what is said more implicitly, and not always

(41) See L. Thunberg, "Early Christian Interpretations of the Three Angels in Gen 18," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 560-570; J. A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 1; Kampen: Kok, 1990), 136-137.

completely clearly, in the book of Genesis. While Genesis speaks about men, the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* says that these figures are neither men nor angels. In this it follows *Jubilees*, which says they are the angel of the presence and the angel of the sanctification. As we have seen, the *Māṣḥāfā Milad* understands these angels to be the Son and the Holy Spirit. In relation to this claim, *Jubilees* is claimed to be a special and highly esteemed witness, because the book was dictated by God to his Son.

Jacques T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN

RECENSIONS

Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew Writings, Volume Two*, (Jérusalem : Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2013), 21 × 27,5, XVIII + 423 p. relié. 30 \$. ISBN 978-965-217-358-4.

Après un premier volume paru en 2010 couvrant les grands rouleaux en hébreu, E. Qimron, avec le soutien de son collègue M. Kister (p. IX), vient de publier dans un deuxième volume ses lectures d'un ensemble de manuscrits hébreux fragmentaires. Après une courte préface et une bibliographie sélective (p. XI-XVIII), les manuscrits sont regroupés en sept catégories : 1) Bénédiction et Malédiction, 2) Paroles-*Dibrē*, 3) Écrits de Sagesse, 4) Commandements, 5) Livres-*sifrē*, 6) Interprétation-*pešer*, et 7) Cantiques-*širē*.

Le premier groupe des *Bénédiction et Malédiction* (p. 1 à 44) commence par les cinq manuscrits 4Q286-290, et d'abord les trois 4Q286-288 avec des recoupements, chacun bien reconnaissable dans le texte recomposé par l'emploi d'encre de couleurs différentes, et les restaurations par des lettres en contour (p. 1-9), principe utilisé tout au long du livre. Quelques lectures nouvelles sont les bienvenues. Suivent les principaux fragments, sur 225 du manuscrit, des *Bénédiction pour les jours du premier mois* = *Prières quotidiennes* (4Q503) (p. 10-19) dans un arrangement un peu différent de celui de l'éditeur, M. Baillet, selon l'appartenance attribuée au quantième du mois mais dont le premier et difficile déchiffrement des fragments de papyrus est parfaitement reconnu. Les *Bénédiction pour la purification* = *Rituel de purification* (4Q512), copiées au dos du papyrus précédent, sont aussi attestées par des recoupements avec les manuscrits 4Q284 aux frgs 33-35 et 4Q414 aux frgs 40-42. Mais ne sont pas notés les recoupements de 4Q512 9-7 avec 4Q414 7 et de 4Q512 11 avec 4Q414 11. Des nombreux petits fragments des *Bénédiction pour la famille*, titre plus large que *Rituel de mariage* de l'édition (4Q502), ne sont retenus que ceux qui ont un contenu saisissable. Mais la lecture de Baillet au frg. 19 7 (Pl XXIX) est à retenir contre celle de Qimron, inexplicable. La composition « Bénis, ô mon âme » (*Barkî nafšî*) est conservée par cinq copies (4Q434 à 438) avec des recoupements conséquents, dont sont repris seuls les principaux fragments.

Le deuxième groupement des *Paroles-Dibrē* (p. 45-109) comprend les *Paroles d'actions de grâces pour les faveurs de Dieu* conservées par deux

copies avec des recoupements déjà repérés par E. Tigchelaar, et sont proposées quelques restaurations (4Q499 et 4Q369). Suivent les *Paroles des luminaires* au titre original, partiellement conservées par trois exemplaires de la grotte 4 (4Q504 à 506). L'auteur suit l'ordre de restauration du rouleau tel que je l'avais proposé dans la recension de M. Baillet et retenu par E. Chazon. Le frg 8 avec le titre au verso est certainement à la première colonne, et je suis étonné que le frg. 9 qui prend place aux lignes 17-22 de cette même colonne n'ait pas été pris en considération (p. 49). Mais l'alignement à la marge droite des restaurations du frg 6 est matériellement impossible. La marge inférieure étant connue aux frgs 5 et 3, on s'attendrait à une numérotation différente des lignes, bien que la correspondance ne soit pas parfaite d'une colonne à l'autre dans ce rouleau non réglé. Sont regroupés sous les *Paroles de Josué = Apocryphe de Josué*, quatre manuscrits, mais les recoupements ne se rencontrent qu'entre 4Q378 et 379, et entre 4Q522 et 5Q9. Aussi est-on surpris de voir séparée la présentation de 5Q9 (p. 62) et 4Q522 (p. 74-76) avec un recouplement non signalé entre 5Q9 2 1 et 4Q522 8 4. Concernant 4Q379 22 ii, j'avais déjà fait pour mon usage une mise en colonne un peu différente et de même pour le parallèle en 4Q175-*Testimonia* (p. 72-73). Certaines des restaurations de 4Q522 9 ii me paraissent impossibles, de ces différences je m'en expliquerai ailleurs. Qimron écarte avec raison l'identification proposée par S. Talmon de fragments de Masada avec l'*Apocryphe de Josué* (p. 62). Suivent les *Paroles de Joseph et de Moïse* partiellement conservées en 2Q22 et 4Q371-372-373-373a (= PAM 43.680 1-3), manuscrits avec divers recoupements. Le *Pseudo-Ézéchiël* préservé en 4Q385-386, 388, trois copies qui se recoupent et 391, rapporte des prophéties et des visions du prophète. Qimron nomme 4Q385 1 ce que l'édition a appelé 4Q385b (p. 84), et il attribue au *Pseudo-Ézéchiël* les frgs 4Q385a 17 et 4Q387 4 (p. 89-90), que l'*editio princeps* a attribués au *Pseudo-Jérémie*. Au *Pseudo-Jérémie* appartiennent sept (en fait huit ?) copies dont quatre avec des recoupements : 4Q385a, 387, 388a et 389, et sans recouplement 4Q383, 387a et 390, s'il faut bien ajouter 4Q481d et le recouplement du frg. 3 avec 4Q385a 1 ii (voir p. 101). Des fragments d'appartenance douteuse sont présentés (p. 101-103). L'attribution des fragments de l'édition des *DJD* qui diffère du tri réalisé par le premier éditeur Strugnell, montre parfaitement dans ce cas la difficulté d'attribution de fragments à un manuscrit précis, aussi Qimron a-t-il proposé avec quelque raison des changements. La manière de présenter les manuscrits du *Pseudo-Jérémie* n'est pas des plus heureuses, puisque les lettres ne correspondent pas toujours au même sigle, le lecteur doit y prêter une grande attention. Des *Paroles de Moïse*, il resterait deux copies 1Q22 et 4Q588 (= 4QDM) identifiées par E. Tigchelaar. Milik avait dès les premières années de l'édition fait un grand pas de pionnier dans la disposition des fragments de 1Q22 et dans leur compréhension ; l'auteur a apporté quelques améliorations et mis en place opportunément le frg. 24 en remplacement d'un autre à la col. IV. Enfin les *Paroles de l'instructeur à tous les fils de l'aube* (4Q298), en écriture cryptique à l'exception de l'entête, reprend presque exclusivement l'*editio princeps*.

Le troisième groupement (p. 110-189) traite des écrits de *Sagesse*. Est d'abord présenté 4Q185, *Sagesse des bravoures divines*, améliorant ça et là

les éditions successives et plaçant le frg. 3 à gauche de III 7-10, et relevant le rapprochement de 4Q370 1 ii 4-9 avec I 10-15 déjà noté par C. Newsom. Bien que devant commencer par *Dibrē* ou *Mišlē*, comme je l'ai proposé en réunissant plusieurs petits fragments qui devaient donner l'en-tête du manuscrit, 4Q525 est groupé avec raison dans les écrits de *Sagesse* dont une autre copie offre des recoupements, 5Q16 identifiée par E. Tigchelaar. Y est joint le manuscrit 4Q184 sur *Dame Folie*. Certaines restaurations proposées à des fragments de 4Q525 sont exclues pour les distances respectives, alors que d'autres sont les bienvenues et complètent la compréhension de passages. L'auteur a renouvelé aussi la lecture de 4Q184, entre autre par les joints à distance entre les frgs 3+2, et 6+5. Sont classés dans ce groupe les quatre copies des *Mystères*, 1Q27, 4Q299, 300 et 301, avec des recoupements à l'exception de 4Q301 qui fait figure à part avec des mots cryptés et devrait être une composition apparentée, sans plus. On ne comprend pas la numérotation des lignes de 1Q27 1 i 13-16 puisque Milik assure que la ligne 12 est la dernière de la colonne, sinon comme séquence purement textuelle mais qui devrait appartenir à la colonne suivante en 1Q27 1 ii. Des joints à distances ont été faits : 4Q299 53+59, 4Q300 2+6+7, 4Q301 2a+2b et 4+5. La composition dénommée *Instruction* est conservée par 'huit' manuscrits mais ne sont donnés que sept sigles : 4Q415 à 418, 418a, 423 et 418* (p. 146), cependant sont ajoutés 1Q26 et 4Q424 par la suite (p. 183-186). La numérotation des lignes à la suite, de 1 à 96 d'un texte recomposé, ne laisse pas de surprendre pour des fragments de manuscrits différents (p. 147-151), de même lignes 1 à 135 (p. 152-160). Concernant l'important frg. 4Q418 69 des lectures sont impossibles : par exemple ligne 6 (= 87) reste de *waw* devant *lamed* excluant *bet* et lire [*lš'*] *wl*, et plus loin *waw-taw* au lieu de *he*, de même ligne 11 (= 92) *he* de *hg|h* est impossible pour le tracé, lire *b[kwl 't]'w bkw| m[qwm]* comme je l'ai proposé ailleurs mais non pris en considération. Noter le joint à distance des 4Q418 88-87 (p. 167), et l'appartenance douteuse des 4Q418 221, 222 et 423 (p. 184). Par le vocabulaire comparable bien que sans recouplement, 4Q424 est rapproché de l'*Instruction* (p. 185-186). Pour en finir avec ce groupe (p. 187-189) viennent les fragments de deux copies qui se recoupent (4Q420 et 421[b]) concernant la *Voie de perfection*.

Avec 4Q462 et 467 qui se recoupent, un texte à la finalité difficilement identifiable, commence le groupe des *Commandements* (p. 190-191). Suivent les fragments de 4Q251-*Midrash des commandements* présentés ici dans l'ordre des citations d'*Exode* 21,1 à 23,19 comme l'a proposé A. Shemesh (p. 192-196). Avec 4Q513-*Ordonnances*, il s'agit de *Controverses* sur la pureté du sanctuaire, celle des prêtres et des offrandes, controverses par endroit (frg. 2 ii avec des joints des frgs 26, 9 et 27) comparables à celles 4QMMT. Aux p. 202-203 sont présentés des fragments de deux copies qui se recoupent 4Q264a et 4Q421 (mis à part ceux qui appartiennent à un écrit de sagesse présentés p. 187-188) dénommés *Commandements du sabbat*. 4QMMT dont six copies ont été retrouvées (4Q394 à 399), est la 'Lettre' comprenant trois parties, envoyée par le Maître de Justice à son opposant qui exerce le pouvoir sur le peuple et lui adjurant de revenir, au sujet de déviations dans des points de la Loi, pour son bien et celui du peuple, afin de bénéficier à son tour des

bénédictions promises à David et non des malédictions à Jéroboam, comme il est écrit (p. 204), ce qui m'a toujours paru tout à fait évident. Sont reprises presque littéralement les lectures de l'*editio princeps* par Strugnell-Qimron pour les deux premiers paragraphes. Cependant pour le troisième paragraphe, on ne peut pas retenir la séquence des trois colonnes de 4Q398 et ses restaurations (objet de désaccords entre les éditeurs), comme je l'ai démontré dans ma note parue dans les *Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, (JSJSup 153/I, 2012, p. 309-339), en proposant de nouvelles lectures et des recoupements avec quelques variantes dans les trois copies de l'«Épilogue». Le manuscrit des *Règles de Pureté* » (4Q274) révisé l'*editio princeps* dans la restauration des colonnes.

Avec 4Q225-*Pseudo-Jubilés*^a dans l'*editio princeps* commence le groupement des 'Récits'-*sifrē*. L'auteur reprend (p. 216-218) l'ordre des frgs des éditeurs, ordre qui me paraît non recevable. J'ai proposé une autre lecture de ces restes et d'autres restaurations de ces quatre fragments, dans « 4Q225 revisité : un midrash essénien ? », *RQ* 101 (2013) p. 169-209, soulignant les recoupements de 2 ii 8-14 avec 4Q226 7 2-7. Mais est changé avec raison l'ordre des frgs de 4Q226-*Pseudo-Jubilés*^b avec le frg. 7 en tête relatif aux patriarches précédant la sortie d'Égypte et l'entrée en Canaan (p. 219-220), voir une restauration différente de ce frg. dans une note « 4Q226 7 revisité », *RQ* 102 (2013) p. 285-290. Aux deux frgs de 4Q227-*Pseudo-Jubilés*^c, Qimron ajoute le frg. 4Q525 19 (p. 221), mais la graphie n'est pas précisément la même comme le montre le *mem* final par exemple ; on ne devrait donc pas changer l'attribution du fragment. À la p. 222 sont présentés des fragments de deux copies de *Ben Sira* retrouvés à Qumrân, mais pour les lectures correctes de 11QPs^a XXI 17 et 18 (non lue), voir E. Puech, « La Sagesse dans les Béatitudes de Ben Sira : étude du texte de Si 51,13-30 et de Si 14,20-10 », dans *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira*, (JSJSup 150 ; 2011) p. 297-329, article non pris en considération. Le livre des *Jubilés* est attesté par quinze copies principalement de la grotte 4 (4Q176 19-21, 4Q416 à 223-224) mais aussi d'autres grottes : 1Q17-18, 2Q19-20, 3Q5 et 11Q12. Les éditions ont été admirablement bien faites et l'auteur les reprend à peu de changements près et les présente dans un texte recomposé suivant l'ordre des chapitres du livre dans la traduction éthiopienne ; il reprend une proposition de Milik en faveur d'un joint à distance des frgs 4Q217 1-2 (mais en 1Q17 1 6, suivre Milik, non Qimron, pour *ky' hw']h*) (p. 234). Le livre biblique de *Tobie* a été retrouvé en quatre copies en araméen (4Q196-199) et une seule en hébreu (4Q200). Milik et Fitzmyer à sa suite sont en faveur d'une composition en araméen traduite en hébreu, Qimron ne se prononce pas clairement en présentant ici la copie hébraïque (p. 243-246). Un sondage montre que la lecture de 1 i 2 *w'šw]bh* est impossible, les trois lettres ne correspondent pas à ce tracé, de même en 1 ii 2 pour *w'p* ; en 2 5 lire *q[h* le début du verset 7 « Pre[nds », et en 7 ii 1 lire sûrement avec les éditeurs *thlt* [non *thly*]. Le *Livre/Testament de Nephtali* est présenté avec des restaurations pour un texte suivi. Vient ensuite l'*Apocryphe de Jérémie C*^e (= 4Q390) présenté comme des « *Prévisions* » ou des révélations divines sur l'histoire future d'Israël selon les jubilés d'années, reprenant l'*editio* avec quelques corrections (p. 248-249).

Le sixième groupement comprend les *pešarîm* (p. 250-306). Viennent d'abord les quatre copies (4Q252, 253, 254 et 254^a) classées dans ce groupe comme *Interprétation de la Genèse* mais sans nul recoupement entre elles, est-il écrit (p. 250), et une seule a préservé le mot *pšr* en 4Q252 IV 5. Comme ce dernier manuscrit ne 'commente' que des passages bien choisis touchant uniquement aux bénédictions et aux malédictions, j'ai proposé dans une note, puisqu'il ne s'agit pas à l'évidence d'un *pešer* thématique, de revenir au titre du premier éditeur, Milik, *Bénédictions patriarcales*, dans une note « 4Q252 : "Commentaire de la Genèse A" ou "Bénédictions patriarcales" ? », *RQ* 102 (2013) p. 227-251, où je donne mes lectures et des restaurations qui diffèrent assez souvent de celles de Qimron qui ne tiennent pas suffisamment compte de la grandeur des lacunes. En revanche noter un chevauchement ou reprise entre 4Q254 II 5-7 et 254 1-5 mais en lisant [ḥm k]y 'm[à la ligne 5 (p. 256). Les deux copies (4Q166-167) du *Pešer d'Osée* ont tiré grand profit du travail de R. Vielhauer en particulier. Des six copies d'un *Pešer d'Isaïe*, 3Q4 concerne le début du livre, les cinq autres 4Q161-165 portent principalement sur le premier livre d'Isaïe (4Q161-163), 4Q164 sur le deuxième livre, et 4Q165 sur les deux. Même si certaines restaurations peuvent être discutées, ces pages permettent de tirer un meilleur bénéfice de ces fragments, (p. 267 corriger frg. 7 i par 6 i, et p. 268, frg. 6 par frg. 7, puis 7 ii par 6 ii). Du *Pešer de Michée*, ne sont retenus que les frgs de 1Q14, laissant de côté 4Q168, d'une main proche de 4Q167, qui pourrait avoir appartenu à un *Pešer des Douze Petits Prophètes* comme l'écrivait déjà Allegro. Est surprenante (p. 278-280) l'insertion du *Pešer* thématique 11Q13-*Melkisédeq* interrompant la séquence des *pešarîm* continus. Je note qu'un certain nombre de lectures rejoignent celles que j'ai proposées il y a quelque trente ans. Toutefois la nouvelle photographie B-285320 demande de lire en 1 ii 5 w'šr // tqwmtmh mrbh mr'bh wmnḥlt... « et parce que //leur soulèvement a amplifié à cause de la faim et de l'héritage de... », mais un certain nombre de restaurations me paraissent impossibles pour la longueur des lacunes, par exemple en 1 ii 15, 22, etc. Vient ensuite 4Q169-*Pešer de Nahum*, texte important pour le point d'insertion de la Communauté essénienne dans l'histoire (p. 281-286). Là encore un certain nombre de restaurations ne sont pas possibles, par exemple 1+2 2 w['n]ny pour les traces et la distance, en 3+4 ii 2 wšqr[ym y]thlkw la distance exige de lire wšqr[wprq y]thlkw, en 3+4 iii 5 lire sûrement 'l [by]t[y]šr'l, en 3+4 iii 7 [h]qhl, en outre le bas des colonnes 3+4 ii et iii sont entièrement récupérables, je m'en expliquerai ailleurs à l'occasion. Qimron restaure 3+4 i a minima pour une largeur de colonne de 13,5 cm, mais on peut restaurer différemment pour une largeur de 16 cm qui est celle la colonne 3+4 ii, voir ma proposition pour les lignes de la crucifixion dans la recension de S.L. Berrin, *RQ* 99 (2012) p. 497. Viennent s'intercaler encore une fois des *pešarîm* thématiques, *Sur la fin des jours* (4Q174, 177 et 182, y rattacher peut-être même 4Q182 et 178), mais sans recoupement des fragments. Concernant 4Q174-*Florilège/Midrash eschatologique*, Qimron suit d'assez près la mise en ordre d'A. Steudel, avec quelques changements de lectures et de restaurations, certaines impossibles, par exemple en 1+2+21 1, la restauration est trop longue mais ligne 4 elle est trop courte pour l'espace et, ligne 5, lire sûrement yh[w]h]

ymlwk l'wlm, et en 1 ii+3+24 2 lire sûrement *]m l'g]wrl*. Concernant 4Q177 l'auteur suit la plupart des arrangements d'A. Steudel, supprime avec raison le frg. 19 qui est assigné comme 4Q525 22, insère le frg. 21, retire les frgs 8 et 15, et propose d'autres compléments de restaurations, mais en 13 ii 8, on ne peut certainement pas lire *'prym*. Suivent les deux *pešarim* *Sur les périodes* (4Q180-181), mais cette fois Qimron n'a pas noté en couleurs les recoupements entre 180 1 4-5, 7-8 et 181 2 1-2 qui obligent à corriger sa restauration et à lire en 181 2 1 *'d 'brh]m['d hwly]d*, de même corriger et lire en 180 1 4 *srk pw[rš m'dm 'd 'brhm]* et à la ligne 9, *rš'h kl 'šr*. En 181 1 ii 2, le copiste a corrigé *swd ndtm* en *bry<'>wtm* en grattant quelques tracés et en corrigeant et les repassant à l'encre, lecture certaine, voir la même orthographe en 2 10. Puis (p. 299) on revient au *pešer* continu avec les deux copies 1Q15 et 4Q170-*Pešer de Sophonie* aux fragments assez réduits, mais en 1Q15 1 6, lire sans doute *]whyw l'r[y]hr[bn*. Viennent enfin les trois copies du *Pešer des Psaumes* (4Q171, 173 et 1Q16), dont l'important *Pešer du Psaume 37* et des restes des Psaumes 48 et 60//108. Le *Pešer d'Habaquq* de la grotte 1 a été présenté séparément dans le premier volume, ce qui dépareille quelque peu ce groupement assez caractéristique des manuscrits de la mer Morte.

Le dernier groupement concerne les *Cantiques-širē* (p. 307-397). Il commence par des *Lamentations sur le peuple* (4Q439 et 4Q469) deux copies qui se recoupent, et 4Q472a, un fragment assez proche ou avec des variantes importantes, puisque 472a 1 2 est à lire *]swp šbty nw(=h?) 'm l'šwt* (faute de lecture ou de copie du scribe), avec un seul mot en commun, il faut donc rectifier le recoupement signalé ligne 1 (p. 307). 4Q179 est une copie de *Lamentations sur la ruine de Jérusalem*. Sont ensuite groupées comme '*Cantiques*' les quatre copies de l'*Apocryphe de Moïse* (1Q29, 4Q375, 376 et 408) qui se recoupent partiellement malgré leur état fragmentaire, les fragments sont présentés dans une possible séquence de la composition originale. Je note qu'en 1Q29 2 5 le renvoi en note à 4Q375 1 6-7 comme tel est exclu, on pourrait lire au mieux *nb]y' wb..[*. Suivent (p. 316-329) les deux copies des *Cantiques du sage pour effrayer les esprits* (4Q510 et 511) qui se recoupent pour un *Cantique*. Des lectures et des restaurations ne peuvent être retenues, comme par exemple en 4Q510 1 2 *[šyr]* est certainement trop long, *[hwd]* serait possible, en 510 1 9 on ne peut lire *hl[* mais sûrement *wl[*, ce que confirme la restauration beaucoup trop longue *[hl(lwhw šdyqym]* en 4Q511 10 8, le seul *šdyqym* y occupe déjà tout l'espace. En 4Q511 1 5 *bk[nwr]* est impossible, aucune trace de base de *kaf* mais jambage vertical suivi d'une trace, en 2 i 6 *[mp]ny* est bien trop court, lire *[hwq]ry*. En 4Q511 8+9 2 il semble possible de comprendre *...b'lwhym[kwl ywd'y]sdq* et en 4-5 *...myr'yw[wmpwg'y]m //l[pt' pt'wm l't'wvw* (voir 510 1 6). En 511 15+17 3 lire *]bwdm ...[g]wrl*. En 511 28+29 4, lire *mgb[ly nd]h <[wz]'wh> w'wlh*. En 511 42 3 *q]sy* est exclu, restes à la cassure, ligne 4, *]n* et ligne 9, *]l'dyk* (avec la photo digitalisée B-362689). Viennent ensuite deux copies, sans recoupement, de *Psaumes non-bibliques* mais attribués à des hommes bibliques « À l'homme de Dieu, À Abdias, À Manassé roi de Judah » (4Q380-381). En 4Q380 1 ii certaines restaurations des lignes 3-7 font difficulté pour la distance à la marge droite, et ligne 7, lire *]l šywn*, en 380 1 ii 8, lire sans doute *'yš hr[w'h (?)*.

Les restaurations pour l'alignement à la marge de 4Q381 77 ne sont pas acceptables. En 4Q381 78 4, lire $w\dot{s}[b]'w[$. Les quatre (voir 11Q5 XXVII 9-10) *Cantiques 'davidiques' à chanter pour chasser les mauvais esprits* (11Q11) avec quelques fragments et les six colonnes à la suite sont en grande partie récupérables pour trois Cantiques au moins. Qimron propose ça et là des restaurations différentes des miennes, mais si certaines sont préférables, bien d'autres ne peuvent être retenues, spécialement quand elles ne respectent pas les grandeurs des lacunes, voir par exemple III 8 [$'\dot{s}r\ h\dot{t}$]' w , beaucoup trop long, IV 10 $w'[rr\ \dot{s}mk]$ beaucoup trop court, V 12 [$y\dot{s}'\ h\dot{s}$] $\dot{d}yq$ beaucoup trop long et ensuite [$l\dot{b}l\dot{t}y$] beaucoup trop court, etc. Des *Psaumes apocryphes* sont présents dans les grottes, tels Ps 151A-B, 154 et 155 déjà connus par les traductions grecques et syriaques, auxquels s'ajoutent d'autres compositions psalmiques (11Q5 et 6 = Ps^{a-b}, 4Q88 (et 1Q30 1 si on estime que l'Esprit Saint est ici l'inspirateur de compositions 'davidiques' ?). (11Q6 est publié en *DJD* XXIII, non XVI, p. 347). En 11Q5 XXVIII 15 (non 14) (p. 348) = Ps 154A, lire $'ny\ b\dot{h}rb[w\ hsr]w\dot{t}y\ 't\ rw[']\dot{s}[w]$, lecture assurée reprenant assez bien 1 S 17,46, non une fois $'ny$ et une fois $'nwky$, etc. À la colonne XVIII 18 (p. 349) = Ps 154B, lire effectivement [\dot{s}] $r\ w\dot{m}\dot{s}[y]l$, une variante de 4Q448 I 9. Le Ps 155 est alphabétique. Suivent la *Prière pour la délivrance du Mauvais* en deux copies qui se recoupent (11Q5 XIX et 11Q8 4-5), l'*Apostrophe à Sion* alphabétique en trois copies qui se recoupent (11Q5 XXII et 11Q6 6, 4Q88 VII-VIII), l'*Hymne au créateur* (11Q5 XXVI), des *Compositions davidiques* (11Q5 XXVII 2-11), un *Hymne eschatologique* (4Q88 IX) mais l'ordre alphabétique y est encore mal reconnu dans les restaurations de Qimron (p. 356) : ligne 4, lire certainement $r\dot{b}ym\ [y\dot{w}]d[w\ l']\ wyhllw\ 't$, ligne 7, restaurer [$m\ \dot{s}y$] wlh , et ligne 8, [$'wd\ ntnw$], noter ensuite la séquence *pe-'ain* (contrairement à l'*Apostrophe à Sion*), et restaurer probablement ligne 15, [$ybrkhw\ \dot{s}dyqym...$; et enfin l'*Apostrophe à Judah* (11Q5 X). Viennent ensuite les *Cantiques pour l'holocauste du sabbat* retrouvés en dix exemplaires (4Q400 à 407 [4Q407 n'est pas inclus dans la liste, p. 358], 11Q17 et *Masada*1k) qui se recoupent partiellement et sont répartis en treize sabbats du premier trimestre de l'année du calendrier solaire et adressés à l'«Instructeur/Sage» (*Imškyl*). Est donnée ici la reconstitution toujours fragmentaire des *Cantiques* à l'aide des différentes copies, comme il a déjà été proposé dans la réédition de Tübingen 4B, 1999, sous la direction de Charlesworth. Une numérotation continue des lignes est adoptée pour les colonnes qui se suivent et même au-delà : 4Q400 1 i+401 15+400 1 ii+3 i-ii+5 pour le premier Cantique, puis 400 3 ii+5 8 ss+4Q401 14 i+400 2+401 14 i-ii pour le deuxième Cantique, puis on passe au quatrième Cantique (p. 363) avec 4Q401 1-2+402 1, puis au cinquième Cantique avec 402 2-3 i-ii+4+Mas1k 1 i+406 1, puis au sixième avec Mas1k 1 i+406 1+Mas1k 1 ii et 405 3 i+403 1 i+Mas1k 1 ii+404 1-2+405 3 i-ii, puis au septième avec 403 1 i+404 3-5+405 4-6+403 1 ii+404 6, puis au huitième avec 403 1 ii+405 8-9+11+11Q17 II-III+405 64+67+403 1 ii+405 13, puis au neuvième avec 11Q17 IV+405 14-15 i+403 3, puis au dixième avec 405 15 ii+16+11Q17 V+405 17, puis au onzième avec 405 19+11Q17 VI+405 18+20 i-ii+22+11Q17 VII, puis au douzième avec 405 20 ii+11Q17 VII-VIII+405 23 i, puis au treizième avec 11Q17 IX+405 23 ii-11Q17 X,

et suivent un certain nombre de fragments non intégrés de ces diverses copies occupant les pages 381-384. Dans cette liste on ne trouve toujours aucun fragment assigné au troisième Cantique ni de mention de fragments (peu significatifs il est vrai) de 4Q407. Qimron propose ça et là quelques lectures différentes de l'*editio*. Enfin sont présentés les principaux fragments de *Prières pour les fêtes* conservées en quatre exemplaires (1Q34+34bis, 4Q507 à 509). On y reconnaît en particulier la fête du Nouvel an et des expiations et la fête des offrandes des prémices. Les fragments 4Q508 39-41 dont Baillet relevait déjà l'appartenance douteuse (*DJD* VII [non III], p. 183), seraient à attribuer à une copie 4Q508a (p. 385). Comme ailleurs dans ce volume sont proposés des textes autant que possibles recomposés.

Pour chaque composition sont donnés d'abord le titre, le nombre de copies, leur datation paléographique, les recoupements s'il y a lieu, et très rapidement les principales indications du contenu et de certaines discussions ou de points de vues différents depuis l'*editio princeps* des manuscrits. On note que les quelques indications bibliographiques qui suivent à la fin de la présentation de chaque composition, en plus des publications originales notées, sont assez souvent limitées et privilégient essentiellement les études des chercheurs israéliens. Quoiqu'il en soit, l'utilisateur de ce volume y trouvera réunis un bon nombre de documents hébreux, même si tous les fragments des divers manuscrits n'ont pas été repris, et il pourra tirer profit d'un travail sérieux de la part de l'auteur. On ne pourra pas ne pas le consulter dans la recherche toujours à poursuivre dans les lectures de ces nouveaux documents, comme ont tenté de le montrer les quelques sondages effectués en cours de lecture pour ce compte rendu.

Émile PUECH

David Stacey and Gregory Doudna, with a contribution by Gideon Avni, *Qumran Revisited: A Reassessment of the Archaeology of the Site and Its Texts* (Oxford: BAR International Series 2520, 2013). ISBN 9781407311388. £29.00. 150 pages; 21 figures; 11 plans.

This volume is divided into three parts which were written independently of each other: an analysis of the archaeological remains at Qumran by David Stacey; an "essay" by Gregory Doudna challenging the notion that sectarian documents from Qumran express opposition to the Jerusalem temple and the Hasmonean high priests (with whom he identifies the sect); and a brief discussion of the Qumran cemetery by Gideon Avni, who questions the association of the burials with a sectarian community. As an archaeologist, I shall focus on Stacey's contribution. I begin by considering Stacey's architectural and stratigraphic arguments and then discuss other points.

Stacey's Interpretation of Qumran

As Stacey informs us, he is an experienced field archaeologist who worked for ten seasons on Ehud Netzer's excavations at Herodian Jericho, "not a scholar of ancient languages or of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (p. 4). Stacey

seeks to free the interpretation of Qumran's archaeology from the influence of the scrolls, arguing that Qumran was not a sectarian (Essene) settlement but instead was part of the royal Jericho "estate," that is, "a seasonally occupied, industrial suburb of Jericho" (p. 71). He begins with a detailed analysis of the architecture and stratigraphy, presenting a different phasing from that of Roland de Vaux, the site's excavator. According to Stacey, "Hasmonean Qumran" (ca. 100-31 B.C.E.) belonged to a line of strongholds established by Alexander Jannaeus. (1) This phase included the tower, an "industrial zone" clustered around three pools in the western sector (circular cistern L110 and rectangular pools L117 and L118), and pottery kilns and "some rooms around a central courtyard" in the main building (p. 34). The main expansion of the settlement occurred under Herod the Great, when the establishment of a new water system (involving the construction of an aqueduct or "main channel") that brought water from Wadi Qumran made possible various seasonal industries, including the production of leather, glue, wool preparation, pottery, rope, mats, and medicines and perfumes. After Herod's death, Qumran (like Jericho) declined as it "was no longer supported from the Royal purse" (p. 70). Stacey's chronology complements Doudna's view that the Dead Sea Scrolls were all deposited in the caves around Qumran in the first century B.C.E., before the end of Herod's reign (although they differ in their understanding of the nature of the Qumran settlement and its inhabitants).

Stacey begins his analysis with the complex of rooms on the western side of the site (the secondary building), surrounding the circular cistern (L110) which de Vaux assigned to the Iron Age. He claims that the aqueduct and water system (except for the stepped, rectangular pools L117 and L118 adjacent to L110) postdate the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. In contrast, de Vaux assigned this system to Period Ib (ca. 100-31 B.C.E.), describing its establishment at this time as "the most striking feature" of the plan of the settlement. (2) The crux of Stacey's argument is that the floors associated with the aqueduct—that is, the floors that abut and connect with the top of the main channel's walls—are associated with de Vaux's Period II (late first century B.C.E. to 68 C.E.). According to Stacey, the walls of the channel were not meant to be free-standing and did not project above the settlement's floors. He therefore concludes that the aqueduct and the pools it fed were not established until Period II, when he believes the site expanded under Herod the Great. The following examples illustrate the weaknesses in Stacey's proposed chronology of the water system.

Floors associated with the aqueduct and the staircase in L113

In de Vaux's Period Ib, L110 was abutted to the south by a room with a plaster floor, which was bounded on the east by the main channel. In

(1) For a response to Robert Cargill's claim that Qumran was a fort in Period Ia, see Jodi Magness, "Was Qumran a Fort in the Hasmonean Period," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 64 (2013): 228-41.

(2) R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 8.

Period II, a short north-south wall that supported a staircase divided this room into two: L109 on the east and L113 on the west (these locus numbers were used for both Periods Ib and II). (3) De Vaux identified an upper floor and a lower floor in L113 (both plastered). (4) The lower floor, which according to de Vaux was the original one (“le sol primitif”), was found under the staircase and was associated with a supply channel for L110 that ran to the southeast under L111 and is shown on the Period Ib plans. (5) Stacey (p. 13) confuses and conflates this supply channel with a roughly built drainage channel that de Vaux uncovered farther to the east in L103, running in the direction of L112 and L113 (although its continuation under L113 was not found), which was established on virgin soil. Since the drainage channel is shown on the plans in the Iron Age and Period Ia, it could date to either period. (6)

De Vaux did not describe the relationship between the upper floor in L113 and the staircase, but noted that the lower floor was discovered only after the wall between L109 and L113 was dismantled. (7) He referred to the upper floor only in the area between L109 and L110, observing that it descended abruptly about two meters west of the aqueduct. (8) The excavation photographs show a plaster floor in L109 and L113. (9) This must be the lower floor as it runs below the bottom of the lowest step in the staircase (which is floating), and it is associated with a row of low stones that was found in L109 in Period Ib. (10) The photographs and site plans for Period Ib

(3) Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Alain Chambon (eds.), *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Aïn Feshkha I* (NTOA Series Archaeologica I: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 327; Photos 227, 231, 236.

(4) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 327.

(5) de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Pl. VI; Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 16 Plan IV.

(6) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 324; shown on 15 Plan III (Period Ia); de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Pl. III (Iron Age); Pl. IV (Period Ia).

(7) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 327: “On enlève le mur entre les loci 109 et 113. Sous les pierres du locus 113, on retrouve le sol primitif...” This can also be seen on the site plans (102, Plan XVII), where the staircase and associated wall are shown in Period II but not Period Ib.

(8) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 327, “Le sol plâtré entre les loci 109 et 110 descend brusquement à environ deux mètres à l’ouest du canal.”

(9) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 110-11, Photos 227, 231, 232, and 233.

(10) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 327; Photos 227, 231, 232, and 233; also see 102 Pl. XVII. Only the two lowest steps of the staircase were discovered in situ. The other stone steps had fallen nearby and were reconstructed by de Vaux, which means the published photographs were taken after the reconstruction. Two low stones visible in the foreground of Photo 233, to the west of the staircase, appear to belong to the supply channel associated with the plaster floor of Period Ib. In Jodi Magness, “A Response to D. Stacey, ‘Some Archaeological Observations on the Aqueducts of Qumran’,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14.2 (2007): 246-47, I identified this plaster floor as de Vaux’s “upper floor” and suggested it might be the second of three floors in this locus, as there must have been a floor above associated with the staircase. I now think

show the plaster floor running up to a step in the northeast corner of L109 which provided a means of crossing over the top of the aqueduct. (11) This evidence indicates that 1) the aqueduct existed in Period Ib; and 2) the walls of the aqueduct (in this area, at least) were elevated above the level of the Period Ib floor.

The walls of the aqueduct and the pottery deposit in L114 (by circular cistern L110)

In L114, a triangular space bounded by circular cistern L110, the south wall of L115, and the east wall of L111, de Vaux found a deposit of dining dishes. The dishes were buried under a fill and began to come to light when the upper edge of the cistern appeared. Lying on a floor beneath the pottery was an iron pick with the remains of a wooden handle, and virgin soil was reached not far below. (12) De Vaux assigned the pottery deposit to Period Ib, while I have suggested dating it to after Qumran's destruction in ca. 9/8 B.C.E. or shortly thereafter (that is, the post-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib). (13) Stacey argues that this deposit must antedate the establishment of the aqueduct because it was discovered "considerably below" the level of the main channel and the raised western wall of the cistern (p. 11).

The field notes, plans, and photographs from de Vaux's excavations suggest that the Period Ib floor with the pottery deposit was the only floor in L114, and that in Period II this locus was filled with stone collapse. (14) There is no evidence that the deposit was "considerably below" the "raised western wall of the cistern," as de Vaux describes the pottery coming to light when the upper edge of the cistern appeared, or that it was "considerably below" the level of the main channel (the relationship to which is nowhere described or illustrated). (15)

Evidence of earthquake damage to the water system

Damage to the aqueduct and pools indicates that the water system was established before the earthquake of 31 B.C.E., as de Vaux concluded. (16)

it is likely the lower floor, as de Vaux mentions only two floors in L113, and because it is associated with the low stones visible in Photo 233.

(11) See Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 16 Plan IV and 102 Pl. XVII (indicated as three stones along the western side of the channel); 110-11, Photos 232 and 233 (in the center of the photo, to the left of the workman). Stacey (p. 13) misquotes me as describing the passage over the channel as a "staircase."

(12) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 114-15.

(13) See Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 124-26; Magness, *Debating Qumran*, 103-6.

(14) See Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 102 Pl. XVII; Photos 222-226, 230, 236. Photo 224 shows the plaster on the Period II wall of L115 (foreground) respecting the stone collapse filling L114 behind it (right).

(15) See Jodi Magness, "A Response to D. Stacey," 247-48.

(16) de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 8.

Although Stacey agrees that the buildings were affected by this earthquake, he attributes damage to the water system to other causes. For example, according to Stacey, the crack in stepped pool L48/48 was due to “the failure of the builders of the cistern to sufficiently consolidate the backfill that supported its eastern wall,” which was built over earlier kilns (p. 22). However, the crack affected not only L48/49 but the loci to the north and south, extending beyond L51 and L66. (17) Stacey even admits that the crack may be the result of an earthquake—but the earthquake of 749 C.E. (following a suggestion by Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg), not 31 B.C.E.! Similarly, Stacey dismisses a crack that runs from northeast to southwest through stepped pool L118, the main channel, L115, and into L111 as “the result of a minor tectonic [*sic!*] movement” (p. 12 n. 7). He argues that the crack is shown in the plan “continuing over” L118—that is, running through the fill in the pool—and that there is no sign of it in the photos. (18) However, as in the case of other pools, the plan shows the built features of L118 (e.g. the walls and steps), not the fill inside it. Furthermore, the crack appears to be visible running diagonally through the step on which the workman in Photo 219 is standing, which is the only photograph that shows the part of the pool affected by it. (19)

Other Aspects of the Settlement at Qumran

As the above review indicates, Stacey’s assignment of the establishment of the aqueduct and water system to de Vaux’s Period II is unsupported by the published evidence. Many of Stacey’s other arguments are equally untenable. For example, as I have pointed out, the published pottery indicates that the settlement at Ein el-Ghuweir was established no earlier than the reign of Herod the Great. (20) The four storage jars which Stacey says indicate a Hasmonean date for that settlement represent a type that continued through Herod’s reign. (21) Stacey claims that the stepped pools at Qumran are not *miqva’ot* (ritual baths) but are cisterns designed with broad steps because they were dug into unstable marl: “The backfill on which the upper steps were built was even less self-supporting so it was technically better to build

(17) See Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 72 Pl. XII.

(18) See Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 102 Pl. XVII; Photos 211, 212, 215, 219, 220, and 239.

(19) Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, Photo 219; the lighting obscures the details, but the crack appears to be visible in front of the workman’s feet.

(20) See Magness, *Debating Qumran*, p. 60.

(21) Pesach Bar-Adon, “Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at ‘Ein el-Ghuweir on the Shores of the Dead Sea,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 227 (1977): 1-25. The storage jars mentioned by Stacey are illustrated in Fig. 10: 2, 4, 7, 8; for the dating of this type see Rachel Bar-Nathan, *Masada VII, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports, The Pottery of Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 51, Type M-SJ6; the type’s general range is ca. 85/75-18/16 B.C.E.; at Masada these jars are dated to the reign of Herod, from ca. 37/31-18/16 B.C.E. In contrast, no pre-Herodian types, such as folded lamps or cooking pots with a tall, everted rim are represented in published corpus from Ein el-Ghuweir.

broad steps across the whole width of the pools than it was to try to construct a narrow set of steps against one side of the pool" (p. 38). This assertion is contradicted by Stacey's own observation that the pools at Jericho—many of which have only a narrow set of steps along one side—were also dug into marl: "Many sizeable pools in Hasmonean and Herodian Jericho were dug into the Lisan marl" (p. 22). (22)

Stacey identifies L77 at Qumran as a storeroom (p. 41) rather than a dining room on the basis of parallels with Herod's palaces at Masada, Herodium, and Jericho. Although the rows of long, narrow rooms at these sites were used as storerooms (as indicated by the associated finds), in this case form does not indicate function. Instead, the elongated form is a result of the roofing system, as without internal supports such as columns or pillars, the width of the room was limited to the length of the wooden beams that could be obtained to span the walls. Rooms limited in width due to roofing limitations could be lengthened to make them larger, but this does not indicate their function. One parallel to L77 at Qumran is the dining room at Khirbet el-Muraq (Hilkiyah's Palace) in Idumaea, which is elongated and has piers or pillar supports at one end. (23)

Stacey's attempt to divorce the inkwells found in L30 (the "scriptorium") from the collapse of the second story level, and his suggestion that the "plastered elements" in this room were attached to the west wall (in which case what were they?) are unconvincing (p. 47). The notation that the inkwells were found "on the upper floor" is a gloss added in Stephen Pfann's translation of de Vaux's notes. (24) There is no basis for assuming that this notation refers to the floor of L15 as it is part of the description of L30. Furthermore, Stacey's argument that the plastered elements must have been attached to the west wall of L30 because they were mixed with fallen mud bricks overlooks the fact that the plastered elements were made of mud brick! Stacey rejects my suggestion that a spiral staircase was installed in L35 (p. 48 n. 48), but does not explain why this small room needed a pillar to support the roof, or why it had two side-by-side doors in the north wall. Stacey's claim that Qumran declined after Herod's death, and was occupied at the end of Period II by "refugees" (p. 51) ignores the substantial first century C.E. remains (including pottery and coins) published from Qumran, which does not have a stratum of "refugee" settlement like the one so clearly attested at Masada (cited by Stacey as a parallel).

Stacey states that the bones found in the animal bone deposits come from animals which were boiled to make glue and gelatin, and were buried to keep

(22) See, for example, Ehud Netzer, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho, Final Reports of the 1973-1987 Excavations, Volume I: Stratigraphy and Architecture* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001), 58 Ill. 84; 105 Ill. 142; 120 Ill. 165; 123 Ill. 170; 130 Ill. 180; 158 Ill. 220.

(23) See Magness, *Debating Qumran*, 32.

(24) Compare Stephen J. Pfann (translated and revised), *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ein Feshkha, Synthesis of Roland de Vaux's Field Notes IB* (Fribourg: University Press, 2003), 24; and Humbert and Chambon, *Fouilles I*, 303.

away flies and vermin (p. 55). This claim contradicts de Vaux's testimony that the bones (which were associated with large quantities of ash and pottery) were laid on top of the ground, (25) and it fails to explain why similar deposits are not found at other settlements. Is Qumran the only ancient site where animal fat was utilized, and flies and vermin were a problem?

Stacey connects the cylindrical jars from Qumran—which are represented in large numbers inside the settlement and in the surrounding caves—with wool preparation, citing as parallels lant jars used for collecting urine from Yorkshire in the U.K.(!) Aside from the questionable relevance of such a distant parallel, this suggestion does not explain why cylindrical jars are distinctive to Qumran. Was wool not produced in a similar manner at other sites around Judea and Palestine? No ovoid or cylindrical jars have been found in Jerusalem and no examples of the “classic” cylindrical jars that are so common at Qumran are represented at Jericho. Only one jar at Jericho is identified as this type by Rachel Bar-Nathan (her Type J-SJ2B), but the lower half of the body is missing and the two large loop handles are unparalleled on “classic” cylindrical jars at Qumran. (26) A small variant of cylindrical jars (Bar-Nathan's Type J-SJ2C) is represented at Jericho by only one complete specimen and “several fragments,” all of which were found in Herodian period contexts in the industrial zone. (27) The rest of the related jars from Jericho are ovoid jars (her Types J-SJ2A and J-SJ2D, a small variant of the ovoid jars), a local type that appeared during the Hasmonean period. (28) Ovoid jars are found at other sites in the Dead Sea region but are rare, with only one specimen each from Ein Feshkha, Ein Boqeq, and Ein ez-Zara. (29)

(25) de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 12-13: “In the free spaces between the buildings or round them the excavations have laid bare animal bones deposited between large sherds of pitchers or pots, or sometimes placed in jars left intact with their lids on. ...As a rule these deposits have hardly been covered with earth. They are flush with the level of the ground. Some of them even seem to have been laid on the ground.” Presumably this method of disposal would have attracted flies and vermin, not kept them away!

(26) Rachel Bar-Nathan, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho: Final Reports of the 1973-1987 Excavations, Volume III: The Pottery* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 24-25; Pl. 2 no. 8.

(27) Bar-Nathan, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho*, 26, Pl. 2 no. 9.

(28) Bar-Nathan, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho*, 24-26.

(29) For Ein Feshkha, see Roland de Vaux, “Fouilles de Feshkha,” *Revue Biblique* 66 (1959): Fig. 1: 4; on p. 252, he states that the ovoid jar comes from a Period III context at Ein Feshkha but represents the same type found in Period II contexts at Qumran. For Ein Boqeq, see Moshe Fischer, Mordechai Gichon, and Oren Tal, *En Boqeq: Excavations in an Oasis on the Dead Sea. Vol. 2, The Officina, An Early Roman Building on the Dead Sea Shore* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2000), Fig. 2.7: 1. For Ein ez-Zara, see Christa Clamer, *Fouilles archéologiques de 'Ain ez-Zâra/Callirrhoë, villégiature hérodiennne* (Beirut: Institut français d'archéologie du proche-orient, 1997), Pl. 12: 15.

Outside Jericho, one cylindrical jar was reportedly found in a second century C.E. tomb at Abila in Jordan, although nowhere is it illustrated. (30) Yitzhak Magen discovered cylindrical jars (which he calls "Qumran Jars") in the late Second Temple period agricultural settlement at Qalandiya, north of Jerusalem. The only complete specimen represented is a small cylindrical jar that corresponds with Bar-Nathan's type J-SJ2C. (31) Only rim fragments are preserved of the other jars. (32) However, one vessel illustrated by Magen (Pl. 7:18) is a juglet with a tall, narrow neck, and the loop handles and profile of another vessel (a jar in Pl. 5:8) indicate that it too does not represent an ovoid or cylindrical jar. The remaining four jars illustrated by Magen might be cylindrical or ovoid jars, although it is difficult to be sure on the basis of the rim profiles alone, since one of the characteristics of this type is a broad, flat or concave base. For example, another "cylindrical" jar published by Magen has a button base. (33) Bar-Nathan published examples of ovoid and cylindrical jars from Masada. (34) Seven jars were found, represented mostly by fragments (including one jar represented by a single rim fragment). Of these one jar is ovoid (M-SJ17A) and two appear to be a small variant of cylindrical jars (M-SJ17E nos. 83-84). In my opinion, the fact that all of these jars come from "Zealot occupation" contexts supports Yigael Yadin's suggestion that the rebels atop Masada were joined by refugees from Qumran after the site was destroyed by the Romans in 68 C.E. (35) If cylindrical jars were used at Qumran for collecting urine in connection with wool production, as Stacey proposes, why are they not represented at sites around Judea and Palestine?

In interpreting Qumran as part of the royal Jericho "estate"—"a seasonally occupied, industrial suburb of Jericho"—Stacey never explains: why Qumran? Unlike Khirbet Mazin and Rujm el-Bahr, Qumran is not located on the shore of the Dead Sea. In contrast to the Hasmonean and Herodian fortified palaces at Alexandrium-Sartaba, Hyrcania, Machaerus, Herodium and Masada, Qumran is not situated on a mountain-top. And, unlike Jericho, Ein Feshkha, Ein el-Ghuweir, Ein Gedi, and Ein Boqeq, Qumran lacks springs (fresh or brackish). Not surprisingly, the only settlements around the Dead Sea that flourished throughout the ages are the perennial fresh water oases

(30) Farah S. Ma'ayeh, "Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Jordan," *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 4-5 (1960): 116, "The most interesting finds were that of an inkwell and a cylindrical jar which are closely paralleled by similar objects discovered at Qumran."

(31) Yitzhak Magen, "Qalandiya—A Second Temple-Period Viticulture and Wine-Manufacturing Agricultural Settlement," in *The Land of Benjamin* (Yitzhak Magen, Donald. T. Ariel, Gabriela Bijovsky, Yoav Tzionit, and Orna Sirkis; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004), 85; Pl. 3: 7.

(32) Magen, "Qalandiya," Pls. 4:19; 5:8; 7:16, 17, 18; 10:22.

(33) Magen, "Qalandiya," 84; Pl. 3:8.

(34) Bar-Nathan, *The Pottery of Masada*, 67-67.

(35) See Yigael Yadin, *Masada, Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (New York: Random House, 1966), 174; Emanuel Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-Biblical Texts?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7.1 (2000): 57-73.

at Jericho and Ein Gedi. Of all the spots in this rugged and desolate region, why would Qumran have been selected as a suitable location for an industrial suburb of Jericho, which is twenty kilometers to the north? Industries connected with the production of leather and wool (such as tanning, dyeing, and fulling) require large quantities of water. The lack of water and other natural resources at Qumran would have made such an investment costly and unfeasible. Why would the “royal Jericho estate” have established these industries on this distant and arid plateau?

Stacey’s “reassessment” is predicated on divorcing the scrolls from the site (p. 63), an association that would support Qumran’s identification as a sectarian settlement. Even without taking this into account, careful readers who slog through Stacey’s detailed architectural and stratigraphic analysis will find that it does not support his proposed interpretation.

Jodi MAGNESS

Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange (eds.), *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 61; Leuven: Peeters, 2011). Pp. xviii + 183. € 45. ISBN: 9042925359

Containing the proceedings from the fourth meeting of the *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible* session, which was held during the international meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature* in Vienna in 2007, this volume is organized into three major subsections. In the first subsection, entitled *The Legal Texts from Qumran and the Hebrew Bible*, Sidnie White Crawford, Innocent Himbaza, and Michaela Bauks explore a variety of topics from the scribal practices of the late pre-canonical period, to an apparent evolution in the architecture of the altar of the Jewish temple, and an implicit criticism of the practice of binding oaths in the book of Judges. Articles by Loren Stuckenbruck, Eckhart Otto, Simone Paganini and Bernard Dolna make up the contents of second subsection, entitled *The Legal Texts from Qumran and Second Temple Period*. In this section the aforementioned authors consider such questions as whether or not portions of the Enochic material contain Mosaic and anti-Mosaic elements, if the Pentateuch and the Temple Scroll exhibit a preference with regard to divine access and the interpretation of scripture (i.e., priests or prophets), whether the author of the Temple Scroll intended to supersede the authority of the Pentateuch with his pseudepigraphic writing, and if the concept of the hidden Torah existed alongside of the revealed Torah in Philo in a manner not unlike that of Qumran. In the third and final subsection, entitled *The Legal Texts from Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism*, Lawrence Schiffman, Günter Stemberger, and Hannah Harrington consider various topics, such as how the Dead Sea Scrolls may shed light on the literary character of the rabbinic writings, whether or not the texts from Qumran confirm the *halakhic* disagreements between the Pharisees and Sadducees in the Mishnah, and if the ritual immersions of the Rabbis included a spiritual renewal through divine agency, as they seem to have done at Qumran.

Of the ten articles in this volume, three deserve special mention. In a thought-provoking piece entitled "The Qumran Pentateuch Scrolls: Their Literary Growth and Textual History," Sidnie White Crawford focuses on the pre-Samaritan Torah manuscripts from Qumran in an effort to show how the Essenes favoured a harmonistic approach to the Pentateuch. Although poorly attested among the Dead Sea Scrolls, examples of the pre-Samaritan scribal tradition, such as 4Q158 and 4QReworked Pentateuch, tend to harmonize material from the Torah so as to create an "internally consistent, 'perfect' narrative by reconciling differences, filling in perceived gaps, completing formulas and finishing command and fulfilment pairs" (5). Tracing the origins of this harmonistic approach back to the 4th c. BCE, White Crawford argues that the Pentateuch seems to have coalesced at some point in the 5th c. BCE and that the pre-Samaritan scribal tradition continued to gap-fill and harmonize the contents of the Pentateuch up to and through the 2nd century BCE. In the centuries leading up to turn of the millennium, the inheritors of this scribal tradition produced works of Rewritten Bible, such as *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, which display many of the same scribal tendencies as the pre-Samaritan tradition and attempt to lay claim to the same authoritative status as the Pentateuch. According to White Crawford, the attestation of these Rewritten Bible texts at Qumran, not to mention the use of the harmonized scribal tradition as a base text in the "Essene family of texts" (6), may well enable us to trace the origins of the Essenes back to the 4th c. BCE.

In a second article entitled "The Pentateuch and Biblical Interpretation in the Enoch Literature from the 2nd Century BCE," Loren Stuckenbruck challenges Gabriele Boccaccini's hypothesis that "in the *main body* of the *Epistle of Enoch* (i.e., 1 En 94:6-104:8) a specifically non- or even 'anti' Qumranic Judaism manifests itself in a form of piety that was steering away from the Mosaic Torah" (44). Limiting his discussion to an examination of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and *Epistle of Enoch*, Stuckenbruck argues that the latter appears to be engaged in a dialog about the proper interpretation of Torah as opposed to expressing an anti-Mosaic or anti-Qumranic polemic. Evidence for this, notes Stuckenbruck, can be seen in the *Epistle's* allusions to the curses and blessings of Deuteronomy 28, which are interpreted in the *Epistle* in an ironic and largely fictitious manner. "The lament that the *Epistle* puts into the mouths of those who are righteous," notes Stuckenbruck, "admits that the righteous (who in the *Epistle* are poor, oppressed and even persecuted) look very much like those who, according to Deuteronomy, should be punished for unfaithfulness to the covenant" (54-55). This admittedly counter-intuitive reading of Deuteronomy's blessings and curses does not, according to Stuckenbruck, represent a rejection of the Mosaic Torah in the *Epistle*. Rather, it is simply the by-product of an attempt to interpret Deuteronomy 28 in an eschatological context rather than a contemporary one, thereby indicating that the author of the *Epistle* was offering an apocalyptic interpretation of the Mosaic tradition as opposed to rejecting it. Based on these and other observations, Stuckenbruck concludes: "it is difficult to agree with Boccaccini's facile pronouncement that this document [i.e., the *Epistle*] contains some 'anti-Qumranic elements' ... the *Epistle*, though composed in the name of Enoch,

is no more anti- or pro Mosaic that it is anti- or pro-Enochic in the way that it uses traditions associated these figures." (57).

In a third article entitled "Light From the Qumran Scrolls on Rabbinic Literature," Lawrence Schiffman focuses on the literary and exegetical trends present in the Dead Sea Scrolls in an attempt to shed new light on the literary forms and interpretive strategies recorded the rabbinic literature. From the outset Schiffman notes that the "Mishnaic laws are generally stated as participial clauses, with the negative indicated by the Hebrew *'en*, but the Dead Sea laws are generally stated in biblical style similar to casuistic laws" (112). Building upon this initial observation, Schiffman then moves on to consider the various ways in which the Zadokite/Sadducean rulings from Qumran differ from the rabbis. According to Schiffman, the interpretation, harmonization, and gap-filling of the Torah in the Zadokite/Sadducean texts from Qumran, not to mention the presence of Rewritten Bible texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls, which "express post-biblical teachings" (113), deviate wildly from the rabbinic approach, which maintains a strict separation between the Written Torah and Oral Torah. Yet another difference between the legal codes of the rabbis and Qumran involve the multiplicity of voices in the former and the monolithic perspective of the latter. For the rabbis, different perspectives and interpretations are to be "debated and harmonized" (124). By contrast, the legal codes of Qumran were intended to be the "authoritative ruling of the authors regarding Torah laws and sectarian regulations" (124). Based upon these and other observations, Schiffman concludes that the legal material from Qumran is, from both a literary and organizational perspective, closer to that of the Hebrew Bible than the rabbinic tradition. In particular, where the legal codes from Qumran conflate, harmonize, and rewrite the Pentateuchal material into new legal positions that are presented in a biblical style and are intended to be as authoritative as the Torah itself, the rabbis maintain that the word of God (i.e., the Written Law) and its correct interpretation (i.e., the Oral Law) are sacred and cannot be combined or superseded by new law codes.

Beyond the three articles described above and an interesting article by Hannah Harrington, which explores the connection between ritual purification and spiritual renewal in the writings of Qumran and the rabbis, the remainder of the volume is haphazard and unfocussed. Much of this lack of focus can be attributed to the somewhat imprecise nature of the publication's title (*The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation*) and to a major editorial oversight regarding the volume's subtitles. Concerning the former, it has to be said that this volume is far more interested in the Hebrew Bible and its interpretation than it is in the "legal texts" from Qumran. Case in point, whereas two of the articles focus on the *Epistle of Enoch* and *Philo*, which are neither biblical, legal, nor Qumranic, another three articles focus almost entirely on specific portions of the biblical material. As for the volume's subtitles, the Table of Contents contains the following designations: "Part One: The Legal Texts from Qumran and the Hebrew Bible," "Part Two: The Legal Texts from Qumran and Second Temple Judaism," and "Part Three: The Legal Texts from Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism" (XV-XVI). However, in the body of this publication the subsections are entitled "Part One: The

Text of the Pentateuch in the Qumran Library” (1) “Part Two: Legal Issues in the Essene Texts from the Qumran Library” (41), and “Part Three: Legal Issues in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls” (109). This lack of consistency with regard to the subtitles and the inexact nature of the book’s title, combined with an uncharacteristically large number of grammatical mistakes throughout, prevent the reader from being able to focus on the contents of the volume or connect the individual articles back to the book’s overarching theme. Although several of the articles represent valuable contributions to the field, the volume as a whole misses the mark and fails to answer how it is that the halakhic texts from Qumran lead us to new interpretations of the biblical law collections or a better understanding of the transmission history of the Hebrew Bible.

Ian WERRETT